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ABSTRACT

DANCING WITH THE CITY:
THE DUDLEY STREET NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVE
AND LAND CONTROL IN ROXBURY

José Antonio Alicea

Submitted to the Department of Urban Studies and Planning in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of City Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology June, 1991

We see from where we stand; and why would we look unless we care about how the story comes out?1

Through this research I define and describe the process of interaction between the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, Inc. (DSNI) and City agencies, including the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) and the Public Facilities Department (PFD), in the development of the Dudley Triangle Project in Roxbury.

DSNI is a community-based organization established to plan and facilitate the development of approximately 500 units of affordable housing in Roxbury/North Dorchester. In order to bring this project into fruition, it has entered into a partnership with the City of Boston. I have looked at this partnership through the theoretical lens provided by Selznick’s cooptative theory. In his study, Selznick schematized the implementation of a government agricultural program through grass-roots participation. He postulated that grass-roots organizations could be used through which to administer a top-down program. In this study, I go beyond Selznick, in that I propose that grass-roots organizations (DSNI) derive benefits from cooptation. The mutual benefits derived from a cooptative relationship are not visible from a top-down view. I also explore the organizational needs that motivate behavior, driving organizations into cooptative relationships. I further broaden Selznick’s cooptative theory to explore the mutual benefit derived as tied to the overarching ideology, tying the two agents into a dance - in this case citizen participation. The data suggest that the organizational structure through which cooptation works has a pattern characteristic of past government/grass-roots relationships. In this case, the DSNI-City partnership has an underlying organizational structure with serious consequences for the neighborhood: power and control within the relationship creates a dominance and subjugation relationship that in this case drives physical development and deemphasizes human development - both of which are central to DSNI’s ideology.

Like a tango, the male dancer seems to control the flamboyant female, as he spins her around and around. But it is she that makes the dance...Roles reverse and diffuse.

Lisa Peattie, Professor Emerita of Urban Studies and Planning, Thesis Supervisor
Don Schön, Professor of Urban Planning, Thesis Reader

1 Lisa Peattie, Planning: Rethinking Ciudad Guayana, p. 5.
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Political officials are not passive bystanders: They are often the source of redevelopment policies and usually have a commitment to carry them out. In doing what they perceive to be their duty, they may resort to behavior that has the intended, or unintended, effect of stifling potential neighborhood response.2

The land control movement in Roxbury has joined a City planning institution (PFD) with an indigenous community planning institution (DSNI) in an inextricable dance. Through this thesis I explore the relationship and interaction between the City, through the BRA and PFD and the Roxbury neighborhood, through DSNI. Through interviews, documents, personal observation, and literature review I will define the relationship and the process of interaction between the BRA, PFD, and DSNI. Why? For a clearer understanding of their inner workings.

On November 10, 1988 after a focused and lengthy community organizing campaign, the Boston Redevelopment Authority granted eminent domain rights to the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI). This action effectively transferred the BRA’s ability to take privately owned land for public good to DSNI.3 DSNI would exercise this legal mandate in partnership with the Public Facilities Department (PFD) in the Dudley Triangle, a section in Boston’s Roxbury neighborhood.

I question what’s going on with community development in Roxbury. The questions are: In the relationship between DSNI and the City of Boston, represented by the BRA and PFD, is this relationship an interaction or cooperation? Or is it accommodation or co-optation? To me, it’s a metaphor of the dance - who’s leading whom? It may also be of use and interesting to find out

3 Although DSNI petitioned the BRA for eminent domain power, legally it created the Dudley Neighbors Incorporated (DNI) to actually hold the land in a land trust. For all intents and purposes in this study, DSNI and DNI are used interchangeably.
what development organizations do when opportunities for development are low as in the current "soft" real estate market and down economy?

Some of the pieces that I need to look at are: Is the building of physical space enough? Is the outcome of building the projected 364 units of housing in the Dudley Triangle Project sufficient grounds for success?

In other words, from the BRA's perspective, and assuming that the BRA's goal in this partnership is to expand the tax base in Roxbury by building a community where before was vacant land, then physical building is enough - it doesn't make any difference who lives there because regardless, in the long run, taxes will be paid.

From DSNI's perspective, and assuming that expanding the tax base is not its primary goal, then physical development is not enough. DSNI's interest in this dance lies in building a community of neighbors, participant neighbors, communicant neighbors. And my question here, given the political climate in Boston now, is whether DSNI can succeed in this partnership with the City - can DSNI accomplish its goals working with the BRA which may have different goals? Expanding on this: political power right now in the City of Boston is not in Roxbury. DSNI's plan includes building housing on vacant lots, which would increase the population in Roxbury. Combined with DSNI's goal of organizing the community, this could produce a critical mass of people, that could pose a political threat to the status quo.

So given the partnership with City agencies, and given the political climate, can DSNI succeed here? Or is it set up for failure? (Once DSNI became a partner with the City and the BRA through MGL 121A eminent domain, it entered into a relationship within the political structure of City politics and Raymond Flynn.

Much has been written about the BRA's exploits in the urban renewal era (Keyes) but its role in Roxbury's land control movement has not been fully documented. As the land control movement
moves from the community organizing and planning phase into the implementation phase, it is important to document the process that made and makes land control of development possible. Moreover, the importance of this research is apparent since DSNI's land-control through eminent domain process is to be replicated in other communities throughout the United States.

I choose the BRA, PFD, and DSNI relationship and process of interaction within the development context as my research project for the MCP degree at MIT. The reason: DSNI's office on Dudley Street is right around the corner from my home on West Cottage Street. As a matter of fact, I live within DSNI's famous Triangle project, which brings the City and DSNI into this dance, this embrace. As I walk out of my home to the corner store "La Bodega" to buy bread or rice and beans, I see the DSNI office, and even though the sign says The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, the vision brings me back to when I walked the streets of the South End where I saw BRA Satellite Offices twenty-five years ago. I have a question here: Is this my personal perception of this? What do my other neighbors think? Why is it that this organization is on the one hand indigenous and on the other hand so inextricably tied to City politics? What are the messages that people get from this? Do they get, "that's my organization and its doing its best for me by using the system which is why it's cooperating with the City" or do they recoil and remember the BRA's hand in gentrification of the South End? Does the fear of being displaced translate into distrust of DSNI? After all, some of the people who live in Roxbury, especially the Puerto Ricans, were displaced from the South End through the BRA's urban renewal program of the late 1960's/early 1970s. These are important and interesting questions, but may be far beyond the scope of this research.

DSNI's work may threaten the political status quo - Flynn's political power base. Indicative of this was the split between Mel King and Raymond Flynn in their bid for mayor where it was clearly racial differences that helped Flynn get elected. Given that Roxbury is where most people of color live, why would Flynn expand his Achilles heel?
An alternative perspective is that Mayor Flynn wants to be seen as a Populist Mayor. He has done great development for South Boston, his neighborhood. He may see Roxbury as the next area for development as a showcase of his populism. He sees DSNI as an instrument to showcase his populism. This may point to Mayor Flynn’s broader political ambitions. To illustrate this, all one has to do is ride through South Boston and look at the development; all municipal buildings have been refurbished. Tremendous municipal investment in recreational programs have been put into South Boston. DSNI’s success can be a real “feather” in his political cap and at minimal cost to the City because DSNI’s funding comes primarily from private non-profit organizations. In this perspective, the partnership is a way for the Mayor to build his political base, satisfy his political ambitions as a populist, and at minimal cost to the City of Boston.

Another piece is the minor dancers at the prom here. They keep cutting in and out. When the real estate market is booming, dancers such as the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency cut in and promise. Do they mandate their own list of people to accommodate? What’s the payback to MHFA when it funds community development through DSNI? Other participants are charitable foundations: The Riley Fund, the Ford Foundation. What are their goals? What are their objectives? What do they see as a positive outcome of their participation in this community-development initiative. How do they measure success? What constraints do they bring to DSNI? What do they get back?

A couple of other pieces: If I make a metaphor of this public-private participation as a dance, then the music is the Massachusetts economy. Because DSNI was created during an upbeat economic period (the real estate market peaked in 1985, during the time of DSNI’s initial organizing victories), how does the dance/interaction change during a down economic period, like now? What does a development organization do when there’s nothing to develop? This is key to find out who’s leading whom here. If DSNI is leading, then the real estate market
wouldn’t matter. They know what they want: They want more than physical development (DAC plan), they want human services development, access to basic services, access to the democratic process, to the decisions affecting their community. These have little to do with the real estate market. So by measuring these I can find out who’s leading whom. Has DSNI made headway in these non-physical, non-market driven community-development goals?

My interest is that I have an opportunity through this thesis to examine my own perceptions of community development, especially the two-pronged: the indigenous and institutional planning by examining an organization in my own backyard, actually in my own front yard. I profit from this research because if it leads me to a positive cooperation, positive participation and an interaction between my neighbors and the City of Boston, I can help dispel the perceptions of displacement and gentrification. In addition, I want to know if this relationship is the inevitable outcome of community development in disenfranchised communities because of market forces in housing, and political power structure. If displacement is inevitable, I use this case like a red flag. My perception may be shared by my neighbors, which may curtail their participation; they don’t want to participate in their own displacement. This may be one of the reasons why it’s so hard to organize the Puerto Ricans in this area because they may also have the picture of the BRA and the City elite encroaching on their community resulting in the difficulty for DSNI to include us.

I was made to confront my biases when I interviewed DSNI’s Andrea Nagel. She pointed out to me that on numerous occasions I kept telling her, “I don’t agree” with her responses. She was pretty calm and waited until I asked her all my questions and wrote down all her answers in my notebook, and then told me that as a researcher, I needed to be careful about how I did or did not control my biases. At this point, I confronted them myself. So that the reader will understand
the lens through which this research has been conducted, I must mention my biases here and allow the reader to continue through this aria a bit more aware of my shortcomings.

As a Puerto Rican member of the majority population in the Dudley Street area and also the poorest and lowest on the economic stratum, any research into my community holds for me the possibility of subjectivity. When discussing power from a powerless standpoint and when discussing control in the community development strategy from a tenant’s perspective, I will admit that the results may be slanted. But I trust that my divulgence will assist the reader in separating the chaff from the grain.

My first thought on my thesis was to draw a comparison between the adversarial confrontation of the South End Community residents and the BRA in the 1960s, which finally culminated in Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción (IBA), and the interaction between the City and the Roxbury community that resulted in DSNI. My advisor, Professor Emerita Lisa Peattie, supported my choice of community organizing and institutional development as my general theme, but also steered me to the changing roles that community organizing groups play over time. For example, she explained to me that groups, when they feel they are not included, voice their opposition and clamor for inclusion. Interestingly, upon inclusion, they are then non-confrontational. She gave me an example: In Great Britain, the Welsh coal miners were in constant conflict with the government because of their exclusion from the process. Over time they organized what I would call confrontational actions to force their inclusion. After time, they were included in the process and now are a constituent group to Parliament itself. So, she indicated groups may be seen as co-opted, when they have in fact been included, and that comparing the confrontational movement at IBA with the interactive participation twenty years later of DSNI was not as exciting as defining the process of interaction and participation, which confrontational groups actively strive for. I agreed. Added to this was that the IBA movement had been written about in a myriad of dissertations and masters theses exhausting
that particular community organizing strategy. I could merely read these and cite them if I needed to round out my argument.

**Definitions**

To familiarize you with the concepts and background, I begin with a few brief definitions, and continue with a description of the neighborhood and its people, then I outline the process, and conclude with a brief analysis. Throughout, I use the present and past tenses interchangeably because the land control movement has been a continuing process.

**The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI):** a community-based planning organization in Roxbury that originated in 1984 from a coalition of concerned community residents, churches, businesses, and human service providers. Organized with a goal of controlling the imminent development of their neighborhood, thereby stemming the "gentrification" tide in Roxbury by building affordable housing, it has over 2000 resident members who vote for a representative board of directors.

**The Dudley Triangle:** That area of Roxbury in Boston bounded by Dudley St., Blue Hill Ave. and Folsom St. (map below)

**The Boston Redevelopment Authority:** The autonomous zoning and planning arm of the City of Boston appointed by the Mayor.

**Public Facilities Department:** The city agency tasked to dispose of City owned land through a variety of programs aimed at neighborhood development.

**Eminent Domain:** The legal right of a government agency or other entity, to acquire private property for public benefit, usually used to build highways and dams, and until this case, never granted to a community group.
121A: The Massachusetts General law that regulates the process of attainment and the exercise of eminent domain rights. In actuality, this law authorizes the establishment of an Urban Redevelopment Authority.

The Process: The process by which an entity is granted eminent domain authority: the entity in this case, DSNI, after a detailed feasibility study applies to the BRA which decides on the application's merits. Its decision is based on an impact assessment and public hearing. The decision must then be approved by the Mayor.
Map of DSNI and the Dudley Triangle
CHAPTER 1
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

In this chapter I synthesize the data garnered from interviews and relevant documents such as budgets and contracts that define the DSNI/PFD/BRA partnership. I then present an analysis of the interaction through an organizational behaviorist's lens drawing heavily on Peter Selznick's Theory of Cooptation and the cooptative mechanism as presented in his book, *TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study of Sociology of Formal Organizations.*

The interesting finding in my research answers the question: What motivates the actors to enter into these types of relationships? Planners, organizers and activists should share my interest in this case because DSNI is being touted by its initiators as a grassroots development effort, the merits of which are to be emulated and replicated in other disenfranchised communities. As such, we must be aware of the pressures exerted on organizations that are, on the one hand, working for social change, and on the other, driven into a cooptative relationship at the behest of its constituent group. The organization's initial goals may conflict with the cooptative goals. Another basis for interest in this case might be to uncover the underlying relational structure that may emerge. The pattern may include secondary relationships, as in this case, the relationship between funding sources and community organizations being contingent on a cooptative relationship. The emerging structure may portray a pattern that is not unique but prototypical. It then can be used to analyze other similar cases. Or the emerging pattern may show that the cooptative relationship is the most viable solution to low income communities as they move to wrest resources from local government. The schematized pattern would give social scientists an insight into the inner workings of these relationships helping to forecast probable outcomes. Regardless of ideology or desired outcome a clear understanding of
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the underlying organizational behavior would expand our knowledge of institutional development.

In his study, Selznick was interested in how government agricultural policy was implemented through existing grassroots organizations (associations) and by creating organizations where there were none. He focused on the role of the dominant (coopting) organization in his study (TVA Tennessee Valley Authority) and its ability or inability to carry out its program. He saw cooption as a form of grassroots participation. Selznick viewed the grassroots associations as an administrative mechanism through which TVA's program would be implemented. He also saw the grassroots through the administrative mechanism as participating in a democratic process. The view he takes is "top down," cooption as motivated by the dominant organization. After all, during the TVA era big government and planning as its instrument were perceived by the grassroots as omnipotent and benign. The government's image was not yet tarnished by Watergate or the Iran Contra Affair. In addition, Selznick concentrates his efforts at measuring the benefits reaped by the dominant organization, TVA.

I propose that in the City/DSNI relationship both the coopting organization and the coopted, benefit. In this research, I go beyond Selznick in that I present and analyze data from both the coopting organization (BRA/PFD) and the coopted organization (DSNI). I also explore perspectives from other interested parties such as DSNI members, constituents, and city officials. I propose that the cooptative relationship between the City and DSNI includes other relationships such as the one between DSNI and its funding sources, whose support is contingent upon the strength of the partnership.

...One of the major tenets...is the injunction that the program of a regional agency be channeled through the existing institutions of the area of operation, and that a positive policy of strengthening those institutions be maintained...this is taken to mean that the institutional resources of the local area will be fully utilized, and a democratic partnership with the people's institutions effected...The concept of a regional partnership includes the idea that ordinary citizens will be drawn into the administration of the regional program through membership in voluntary associations. Wherever the execution of the over-all program reaches out into a local community, it is
considered desirable to organize those citizens most closely affected into an association which will participate in the administration of the program. There is thus envisioned a mushrooming of citizens' organizations at the end point of administration, permitting participation at the grass roots in the application of a general policy to varying local conditions. ⁴

The mechanism in place in the DSNI/City partnership he defined as formal cooptation as "when there is a need to establish the legitimacy of authority or the administrative accessibility of the relevant public." His theory is relevant to this case because, as in his study, the BRA and PFD as regional organizations have included DSNI into the administration of community development planning and implementation in the Dudley area, heretofore the city's (BRA/PFD) responsibility.

**THE COOPTATIVE MECHANISM**

"Cooptation is the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structures of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence." ⁵ As such, it functions as a defense mechanism, an organizational response, deriving from the organization's primary need, which is "the security of the organization as a whole in relation to social forces in its environment."

Formal cooptation ostensibly shares authority, but in doing so is involved in a dilemma. The real point is the sharing of the public symbols or administrative burdens of authority, and consequently public responsibility, without the transfer of substantive power; it therefore becomes necessary to insure that the coopted elements do not get out of hand, do not take advantage of their formal position to encroach upon the actual arena of decision. Consequently, formal cooptation requires informal control over the coopted elements lest the unity of command and decision be imperiled. This paradox is one of the sources of persistent tension between theory and practice in organizational behavior. The leadership, by the very nature of its position is committed to two conflicting goals: if it ignores the need for participation, the goal of cooperation may be jeopardized; if participation is allowed to go too far, the continuity of leadership and policy may be threatened. ⁶

---

⁵ Selznick, p. 259.
In the following model, I map out Selznick's cooptative mechanism. I use this model as a framework upon which to hang differing perspectives "like ornaments on a Christmas Tree."

Organizational need
"the security of the organization as a whole in relation to social forces in its environment"

Organizational response

Mechanisms of defense

Ideology

Cooptation
the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence

Formal cooptation
when there is a need to establish the legitimacy of authority or the administrative accessibility of the relevant public

Informal cooptation
when there is a need of adjustment to the pressure of specific center of power within the community

---

CHAPTER 2
ECONOMIC HISTORY AND DEMOGRAPHICS

THE DUDLEY TRIANGLE

According to the 1980 census, there were 1,957 residents in the Dudley Triangle area (comprised of about 55 percent blacks, 30 percent Hispanics, 10 percent whites and 5 percent other races). The Dudley Triangle's residents are primarily young blacks, Cape Verdeans and Hispanics living in larger families. Two-thirds of these families had children under 18 years old; half of these were headed by single mothers. The poverty rate in the area was 35 per cent in 1979, almost twice the Boston rate of 20 percent. The unemployment rate was 17 percent in 1980 compared to Boston's 6 per cent rate. The median household income in 1979 was $8200 only 65 percent of the Boston median.

The Dudley Triangle area was a site of property neglect and decay as reflected in the prevalence of vacant land, tax delinquent property, scattered ownership of small parcels by numerous non-resident owners, and relatively little building permit or zoning variance activity. In addition, the existing structures were in poor condition. The overall land area is approximately 80 acres, almost half of which is vacant (30 acres or 1.3 million square feet of land). One-half of the vacant land is publicly owned (200 parcels), the other half is privately owned (181 parcels). The private vacant land is owned by 131 different people. Eighty-one of these owners, or 62 percent of the total, are absentee landlords, probably speculators. Many cannot be located even after extensive attempts.

The housing stock is in moderate to poor condition with high numbers of abandoned buildings and lower property values than the Boston average. In 1987 a house in the Dudley Triangle was
assessed at about $70,000 compared to $156,000 for a similar house in Boston proper. The data revealed a 14 percent vacancy rate and a decline in rentable units, most of which were vacant because of sub-standard conditions.

It was in this historically disenfranchised and deteriorating neighborhood that the seeds for a unique "grassroots" community land control movement took root.

The Triangle straddles Roxbury and North Dorchester neighborhoods of Boston. I will present the history and demographics of both, bearing in mind that the Triangle reflects more of Roxbury's profile than North Dorchester's. Because the Dudley area does coincide with both of these neighborhoods and to preserve the study's internal validity, I will present data and analysis of both neighborhoods. The North Dorchester area takes into its borders more affluent sub-neighborhoods than the Dudley area, I conclude here that Roxbury's demographics are more representative of the DSNI area under study and I will use the Roxbury profile to present and analyze relevant facts about the Dudley Triangle Project.

THE HISTORY OF ROXBURY: DISPLACEMENT

Roxbury's history has been characterized by uneven development, displacement, general economic decline and a sense of desperation for the minority community. Thus, the land control movement is an effort to restructure the institutional relationship between the central City and Roxbury so that concerns and issues of people of color are addressed, rather than ignored or marginalized.

In 1629 the town of Roxbury was founded and annexed to Boston in 1868. Since the annexation in 1868, the Roxbury area has served as a depository for the negative externalities created by

---

Boston's growth. The first major development in Roxbury, which occurred between 1840 to 1870, was a response to the expensive townhouse prices in Boston. During this thirty year period, less expensive versions of Boston townhouses and detached singles and two family houses were constructed along Dudley Street to satisfy the overflow of demand from Boston. However, the majority of the development took place between 1870 and 1900 as streetcar service was extended into the area and the bays between Roxbury and Boston were filled.

The pathology of Roxbury's physical environment is easy to summarize. As the street railway brought increasingly low income groups to the area, the new groups' limited means forced them to adopt an extremely pinched form of building. Thus, while parts of Roxbury remained primarily an affluent residential district during the 19th century, northern Roxbury became the site of a dense residential and industrial district for the lower income population.

As lower income black families located in northern Roxbury after being displaced from the lower north slope of Beacon Hill and the North End, Jewish families moved into the southern sections, replacing earlier residents who were predominantly Irish. Today, this cycle of successive waves of low income settlement in Roxbury has continued to endure as Latinos and Cape Verdeans have found their way there.

This history of low income migration has been characterized by the arrival of different immigrant/migrant groups. The late nineteenth and early twentieth century was a period of enormous immigration in U.S. history. This period of immigration brought successive movements of lower income, ethnically diverse groups into the Roxbury and Dorchester area. First came the Germans and rural Americans, then Canadians and Jews, followed by blacks and now Cape Verdeans and Latinos.

The common thread that linked all these groups was their low family income; each change bringing a group with lower incomes than the previous one. The incurable problem of Roxbury and Dorchester at this time was not that low income groups had come to destroy what was
Economic History and Demographics

pleasant in its physical environment, but that no income group had as yet succeeded in building a satisfactory environment either for itself or for its successors.

During the 1940s through the 1960s, there was a significant migration of blacks from the South. In ten years, the racial composition of the Roxbury area changed from 80 percent white to 80 percent non-white. Concomitantly, the Roxbury area suffered from disinvestment, abuse and neglect through loss of housing and industry and injustice at the hands of the state through urban renewal and highway clearance.

While the post-World War II era rejuvenated the Boston economy, it devastated Roxbury. As a low income community of color, Roxbury fully experienced the negative side of uneven development. Massive disinvestment; "red lining", arson and abandonment characterized this period.

In Boston, industries were rapidly leaving, either for the suburbs or out of the region completely. This period created a substantial decrease in Boston's job market and led to a large exodus of people from the central City. As economic opportunities in the suburbs increased, whites left the City in droves and this opened the door to minority migration and settlement.

Boston's economic renaissance of the late 1960s and early 70s delivered another economic blow to the Roxbury area. During this time, massive investment in downtown Boston came at the expense of poor areas. This, along with the levying of disproportionately higher property taxes, due to outdated appraisals by the City, created a recipe for urban dilapidation. As property taxes increased, the area received poorer City services leading to physical deterioration. The effects of these policies led to increased land abandonment and general urban decay.

The results of this history reflects an uneven distribution of income and wealth between Boston and Roxbury. The City has witnessed a changing labor force, a downtown investment boom, and
a growing population of “yuppies” gentrifying its neighborhoods and exerting pressure on the minority community.

In fact, with a third of the City’s vacant land presently located in Roxbury incentives for investment and displacement are enormous. It is this history of continual neglect and the desire to rectify it that has fueled the land control movement culminating in DSNI.

THE HISTORY OF NORTH DORCHESTER: TRANSPORTATION DRIVEN

Although DSNI’s Dudley Triangle Project is entirely within Roxbury’s boundaries, the Dudley neighborhood and DSNI’s secondary development phase extends well into North Dorchester. North Dorchester/“Uphams Corner Planning District,” as the area is designated by the BRA, includes a very diverse ethnography and different neighborhoods, from the predominantly Black and Hispanic Dudley area to the exclusively White Savin Hill neighborhood. In addition, the modern mixed-income community development experiment, Harbor Point, is also within North Dorchester’s geographic boundaries. However, we are concerned here with the Dudley area and because DSNI straddles Roxbury and North Dorchester, it is important to analyze in this section relevant census data and present the history.9

North Dorchester history dates back to 1630, when Puritans landed at Columbia Point, then known to the Native Americans as “Mattapanock.” The early settlement was a colonial stronghold, originating on Meeting House Hill and protected against Indian attacks by the Savin Hill Fort. Boston Harbor’s South Bay, visible from Dorchester’s hilltops, isolated it from the City proper. During the 1800s, wealthy Bostonians built country estates as summer homes in Roxbury and North Dorchester. At the intersection of today’s Columbia Road and Dudley Street, a commercial center sprouted from a small grocery store owned by Amos Uphams,

9 This section is paraphrased from North Dorchester: Neighborhood Profile . BRA (1988)
thus the name Uphams Corner. Here, travellers and in those days this meant horse and carriage, would stop on their way to and from Boston, encouraging a community to grow. During this same time, Dudley Street became a working class spine, running from Dorchester to Boston. The industry of the day was textiles and commerce between the milltown nodes was booming due to technological advances in transportation. In 1885, Boston-Providence Railroad opened, replacing the horse as the main mode of transportation.

In 1857, the electric tram brought the Dorchester hills closer to Boston, making the neighborhood more accessible and attractive. Dorchester residents voted for annexation to Boston in 1869, and development expanded because of the increased infrastructure, such as municipal water supply and public transportation. Development reached its zenith between 1870 and 1914. This epoch saw the building of the famous "Dorchester triple-decker," which was cheaper to build than the Victorians of the previous development boom. At Uphams Corner, the world's first and largest supermarket, Cifrino's, anchored a transportation node that opened the way for the present metropolitan suburban regional development.

As older Bostonians moved to the suburbs, a new influx of working class people took advantage of the advances in public transportation. In 1927 the rapid transit line, today the red line between Dorchester neighborhood Andrew Square and Fields Corner, brought Boston even closer with a scant 15-minute train ride. The increase of immigrants during the 1930s exacerbated the migration of the older established families to the suburbs.

In 1959 the Southeast Expressway, today the Central Artery, opened. Nationwide, railroads slumped and railroad lines closed across the country; it was more efficient to transport goods by truck. Dorchester saw its first wave of Blacks as they replaced the Jewish community as homeowners in many areas of Roxbury and Dorchester. The influx of Blacks was mainly fueled by the Boston Bankers Urban Renewal Group (BBURG), which targeted the Dudley and
Brunswick-King neighborhoods of Dorchester for minority mortgages. I call this phenomenon "greenlining."

The 1970s saw the influx of its present ethnic makeup. Latinos and Cape Verdean families are now the principle homeowners in the North Dorchester area (although within the DSNI area Hispanics are not well represented as homeowners). These new immigrants have had a stabilizing effect on the area. The Uphams Corner-Jones Hill section, the former being in DSNI's secondary development area, is home to its White families.

The DSNI area that lies within North Dorchester is more kin to Roxbury in racial makeup and in its economic profile. I refrain from expanding the analysis of the data presented on North Dorchester for fear of misrepresenting DSNI's profile. For example, according to the US Census of Populations and Housing of 1950-1980, North Dorchester's racial/ethnic composition consists of sixty percent White, eighteen percent Black, and thirteen percent Hispanic. The data is skewed because of the inclusion of the predominantly White areas of Boston within North Dorchester's SMSA, but as mentioned earlier, compare this with Roxbury's profile of eighty-nine percent Black, 7.5 percent Hispanic, and five percent White. The figure for Hispanics here is misleading because the heaviest influx of this group into Roxbury has occurred during the 1980s; now, by conservative standards, the count is estimated at twenty percent.

In addition, the North Dorchester median income is higher than Roxbury's, reflecting again the "outlier" neighborhoods. In 1984, North Dorchester's median income was slightly lower than the Boston average. In 1980, Roxbury's median income was only seventy-four percent of the Boston average.

In 1980, thirty-four percent of Roxbury households were on public assistance, more than double Boston's fifteen percent and more than quadruple the eight percent nationwide.
A relevant statistic is the large number of families headed by women. Fifty-four percent of all Roxbury’s families, as compared to thirty-percent City-wide and fourteen-percent nationwide.
HISTORY OF THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Boston's urban renewal program originates from the federal Housing act of 1949 which put forth the honorable policy "of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family." The Act also enabled municipalities to establish Local Public Agencies (LPA's) with the power "of taking privately owned land by right of eminent domain, clear it of existing structures, and sell it to private developers for construction of new residential buildings." The ideology for this policy was rooted in the public-housing-slum clearance movement which viewed slums as undesirable blemishes upon a cityscape to be eradicated.

In 1954 the Housing Act expanded the requirements in order for municipalities to receive federal funds for urban renewal to include point #6: "local citizen participation in developing and executing the urban renewal program." According to Selznick's cooptative mechanism, "Government policymakers and planners originally viewed citizen participation in social programs as a way to legitimize government action."10

The tendency for participation to become equivalent to involvement has a strong rationale. In many cases, perhaps in most, the initiation of local citizens' associations comes from the top, and is tied to the pressing problem of administering a program.11

11 Selznick, p. 220.
In 1957 the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) was created. From its inception, the BRA was required to include community participation, which when implemented, translated into some minimal involvement as a prerequisite to achieving its ends.

Boston during the 1950's was experiencing an urban malaise characterized in its declining tax base, white flight (mortgage driven), business decline, escalating tax, deteriorating housing stock, poor public services, and increasing influx of immigrants which further strained the already over stressed municipal services delivery system.

Political power was held by the City’s Irish population which dominated City services and City jobs through the Mayor's office and the City council. Urban renewal was to be Mayor John Collins’ stake to political fame. Elected in 1959 he saw the urban renewal program as an opportunity to use federal funds to redevelop Boston with the goal of expanding the City’s tax base by bringing back the fleeing middle class and encouraging the “Yankee” economic power brokers to engage in a symbiotic relationship with his political constituency-- the Irish.

Mayor Collins hired Ed Logue of New Haven, Connecticut's urban renewal fame to design an urban renewal program that would be the highlight of the ambitious Mayor's political career. As a consultant to the City, Logue faced little opposition to his equally ambitious plan and the urban renewal arm of the Boston Housing Authority for Boston. This bold plan called for the restructuring of the Boston Planning Board into one consolidated organization— The Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA)— under his control.

Under Logue's reorganization the BRA became a centralized planning and implementation agency and its director, was accountable only to the Mayor. To Logue planning and politics were inseparable and he enjoyed complete support of the financial and real estate interests, and the City’s media. During the agency’s inception Collins let Logue wield autonomous power which
emanated from his ability to attract funding for his plan at a projected ninety million dollars ($90,000,000).

Upon election, Kevin White brought his ideology of the *New Boston Ideology* to the media front. Mayor White was a non-populist mayor and controlled all the development in Boston during his tenure and downtown development was the driving force.

This was partly due to the 1970s low real estate market and Mayor White's "giving away the store" to attract developers. During the 1970s, Mayor White was the BRA director. He personally approved every major project in Boston. "If you didn't play ball with Kevin, nothing gets done in Boston." On the other hand, the real estate boom of the 1980s was a real contrast. Lured by Mayor White's bait in the 1970s, developers with incentives to make high profits in the current real estate market were exerting tremendous political pressure on the City administration.

- Muhammed Salaam, BRA

The 1980s saw a turn in Boston's politics. Raymond Flynn was elected on a neighborhood agenda. His populist platform includes integrationist politics and working class inclusion. His media image is the neighborhood mayor. The BRA's ideology shifted to neighborhood planning in concert with their political leader's.

The foregoing history is important to illustrate the origin and basis of the BRA and the political ideology during the era of its birth leading us to today.
Historical political influences are diagrammed in the chart below. Here it is interesting to note the similarities between the origin of the BRA and the origin of DSNI.

In 1949, through the Housing Act, the Federal Government gave municipalities the power to create redevelopment authorities with eminent domain power to take private land for public good and through HUD funded the Boston Redevelopment Authority to the tune of $90 million.

In 1988, DSNI petitioned the BRA through Massachusetts Law Chapter (MGL) 121A that transferred the BRA's eminent domain power to DNI - to take private land for public good. This power came from the BRA to DSNI - with no public money.
In the first instance, the creation of the BRA, the federal government was getting out of housing production by decentralizing its responsibility and accompanying power. DSNI is a further decentralization of power from the City [BRA] down to the neighborhood level. Putting this decentralization movement in political and economic context: DSNI’s beginnings parallel the privatization movement in President Reagan’s ideology (Reaganomics). In actuality, corporations and the higher income bracket population are given tax benefits through charitable contributions to foundations and charities, which in turn become the funding source for organizations like DSNI - the trickle-down theory. Here the question is, what are the strings that are attached to this money? We need to follow this thread. What has changed as a result of the federal government abdicating responsibility for community development? If community development is funded privately, what are the new constraints? What are the new goals and based on whose values? How is success evaluated? (fiscal efficiency vs. responsibility to human needs) What are the consequences of these changes?

**THIS DANCE HAS BEEN DANCED BEFORE**

Between 1968 through 1973, HUD had allocated to Boston through the Model Cities Program forty million dollars. The Model Cities Program covered parts of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Jamaica Plain.

These funds could be used for a wide variety of purposes within the designated area: family life centers, programs of higher education, emergency rehabilitation grants, physical planning, support of City services, and many other programs.\(^\text{12}\)

The reason that I’m interested in the Model Cities Program in Roxbury is because its goals mirror DSNI’s goals for comprehensive planning in Roxbury. With all those funds spent in the

\(^\text{12}\) Urban Renewal and Planning in Boston, p. 22.
Model Cities Program in Roxbury, why did Roxbury need another comprehensive plan? So my concern here is, if the dance was danced before, why are we dancing this dance again? This would help me to understand the relationship between the city and DSNI. The BRA now is continuing where Model Cities left off. I guess the reason that I’m adding the Model Cities piece is to add the perspective of those community residents who have waged a participatory struggle at least since the 1960s and have had the federal funds to have been successful. And now the lack of success may color their view on organizations like DSNI and the BRA.

When, however, the community possesses a history of cooperative effort, and a long acquaintance with its machinery, a new formal organization may be caught up within the older network and provided with a leadership and with well-established channels of access to the people of the area...It may, therefore be suggested as a hypothesis that the strength - in terms of local control and meaningful participation - of voluntary formal organizations established to implement administrative objectives will depend upon the initial social organization of the community...13

Their question might be, “are we being used to bring in money from federal programs - and now private charities - to support development somewhere else or that benefits someone else.” The Model Cities program had huge amounts of money. And our communities are still disenfranchised, still devastated, still have the lowest income, and still have the highest infant mortality rates: Young African-American males were safer in the hundred-hour offensive in Kuwait than in their homes in inner cities across America. Was the Model Cities Program a success for Roxbury? How do you measure it? Is DSNI Model Cities all over again but decentralized and privatized?

**THE MANDELA THREAT**

In 1986, the mayor’s authority over Roxbury was threatened as Project Fate launched the Greater Roxbury Incorporation Project (GRIP). Project Fate’s proponents were actively

organizing the Roxbury community for the incorporation of Mandela, a separate municipality with the general boundaries of Roxbury within it. One of the main thrusts to their position was the necessity of Roxbury residents to control development - especially that proposed by the BRA for Dudley Square. After the organizing the question was put before the community through a referendum vote. It was also on the ballot in 1988. Although defeated, it took media bias, political pressure, and a well-financed campaign led by Mayor Flynn to defeat it. The debate over GRIP showed that Mayor Flynn’s political ambitions and neighborhood mayor image were in jeopardy.
BRIEF HISTORY OF DSNI

It’s Friday the 13th, April, 1984. MIT DUSP alumnus Nelson Merced is in his office at Alianza Hispana. He is expecting Robert Holmes, of the Riley Foundation. Mr. Holmes is making a site visit to the inner-City agency that he will be helping by funding a rug. Twenty-thousand dollar rugs for Mr. Merced’s agency. Robert Holmes, a lawyer and a trustee to the Mabel Riley foundation, arrives, but is more curious. He sees the deprivation, the hopelessness, on his taxi ride through Roxbury. He just can’t seem to digest that his contribution to community development is a rug, only a rug. After he meets with Nelson Merced and after Nelson points out to him the empty lots, the vacant and abandoned buildings on his wall map, Mr. Holmes vows to move the rest of the trustees to concentrate their donations in Roxbury on a comprehensive plan - a new initiative if you will.14

According to Mel King, there was concurrent organizing in Roxbury around land control. In 1983, at the same time that the initiating group of DSNI was meeting, the Greater Roxbury Neighborhood Authority (GRNA) body was also being born. Don Schön also presented a perspective on organizing that has been missing to this point. He had been working with Alianza and Nelson Merced in a program that he referred to as the Community Search Conference. Consequently, when Nelson was approached by the Riley Foundation, the seeds for this new initiative had already been sown. Was the organizing a reaction to the Dudley Plan,

---

or was it, as Mel King says, proactive organizing and just circumstantial that the BRA’s plans emerged simultaneously?

There definitely is a relationship between the BRA and DSNI and DSNI is actually a reaction to the BRA’s Dudley Square Plan, which was leaked to the Herald by [probably] somebody in the City council. That’s the origin of the relationship. It’s a reactive strategy to the BRA’s development plan for Dudley Square, which is in the heart of Roxbury. Supposedly the City was going to pump in 750 million dollars into the heart of the City’s poorest neighborhood.

- Kelly Brown, Development Director, DSNI

Holmes and Merced were the moving force in instituting the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative. But as top-down planners and lawyers, they were sure that the neighborhood would be best served if the agency directors and human service providers were the driving force. They soon learned that Roxbury residents would not be led by external forces. At the first community meeting, the die was cast for the community residents’ involvement.

According to neighborhood resident and participant at that meeting, Tubal Padilla, the residents were presented a charter by Alianza Hispana and other agencies that would institute an organization to drive community development in the neighborhood. Individual residents voiced their concern over the makeup of this new organization. The charter initially proposed little community representation on the Board. They also voiced disgust over the agencies’ insensitivity. He said that discontent with the area’s agencies had been longstanding and the community would not accept agency leadership in the planning of their community. Most of the agency heads lived outside the community, but purported to represent the community’s interest in the emerging organization. Tubal defined the issue being the definition of “community,” who was “the community?” This is consistent with Don’s perspective when he said that there were residents on his community Search Conference Group leading to the first meeting. But contrary to Don’s view, Tubal did not see any organized groups at that meeting, just individual residents. Mel stated that his organizing was in conjunction with the Burgess Fund, which was affiliated with the same group that Don was working with. Mel was not at the meeting, but said that he
helped organize GRNA after DSNI organized to encompass a larger area in the land control movement. If there was solidarity, it was among the Muslims, but according to Tubal even they disagreed on the finer points of the organization. As Tubal pointed out, it was mostly individual residents that came to make sure that they were involved in decision making in their community. They saw it was an opportunity to make the agency heads aware of their discontent with their services and to show them that without the members of the community, their plans would be fruitless. What's important here is that "we see from where we stand," as Lisa Peattie suggests. But also we sometimes see what we want to see. For example, in retrospect, those involved may have grouped together circumstantial events and also grouped together individual people into groups that may not have been the reality at the time.

The initial agency members to DSNI were the following: Alianza Hispana, The American Muslim Mission, The Cape Verdean Community House, The Roxbury Multi-Service Center, Nuestra Comunidad, and The Dorchester Bay Economic Corporation. To familiarize you with these agencies and their needs, in the following section I present a short biography of each.

**Alianza Hispana:** A multi-service social agency located at the apex of the Dudley Triangle. It's primary clientele is the area's Hispanic population, mostly Puerto Rican. It contracts with the City and state through the Requests for Proposals. Its stake was the imminent displacement of its client population. Historically technically proficient, its staff was the prime facilitator in DSNI's origin.

**The American Muslim Mission:** A religious organization that ran a school within the Triangle. Its members lived within the DSNI area. The school is situated in the most blighted area. The Muslim community has been growing and within DSNI there are temples, mosques, businesses, and other affiliated organizations.

**Cape Verdean Community House:** A multi-service social agency adjacent to Alianza mostly serving the area's Cape Verdean community. It was housed in a dilapidated municipal
building. As an emerging community the Cape Verdeans were in the institution building stage. This was one of the Cape Verdean community’s first organizations in the area. Its stake was the control of the municipal building and the increased funding to rehabilitate it. The building is now abandoned.

The Roxbury Multi-Service Center: A multi-service social organization anchoring the Black community. It was founded during Model Cities and has been instrumental in Roxbury’s emergence. Initially competed with Alianza for Model Cities funding.

Nuestra Comunidad: A community development corporation spawned by Alianza Hispana to avert the displacement of its client group. It stood to gain as a developer for the planned community. Housed between the Cape Verdean House and Alianza Hispana. It has developed and owns extensive property in the DSNI area.

The Dorchester Bay Economic Corporation: A community development corporation representing the Upham's Corner area of DSNI. It, like Nuestra, has been successful in development. It wanted to be the controlling factor in its area.

St. Patrick’s Church: By virtue of its physical space and receptive pastor, it was a driving force behind DSNI. The community-wide meetings originally were scheduled in this centrally located church. It stands to gain a new parish because its original parishioners, the Irish, moved to the suburbs. DSNI’s annual meetings and other organizing meetings are still held there.

Alianza Hispana, Nuestra Comunidad, Cape Verdean House, and St. Patrick’s Church would benefit immensely from the Dudley Triangle development by virtue of their being physically located at the Dudley Triangle’s apex. During the initial organizing the area had no identity and no attraction, just blight.
These community service providers would soon learn that their clients had a voice, and their voice would be heard. Because of the concerns brought up by the residents, a committee was set up to draw up a more inclusive governance structure. They defined community geographically to include the diversity within the geographic boundaries. After about three months, at a subsequent meeting, a new proposal was presented. At this meeting, the residents pressed for their inclusion. They made it clear that no external group would plan their community without their involvement and that new elections to DSNI would have to take place immediately. This created the present DSNI Board of Directors, where thirty-two directors representing every sub-neighborhood and every ethnic group participate to weave the overall community vision.

The initial Riley grant to help organize DSNI was a mere sixty thousand dollars. The future will surely tell if participatory planning, true participatory planning - as opposed to superficial rubberstamping - is working through DSNI. On with the dance...

**"DON'T DUMP ON US:" TRASH TRANSFER CLOSINGS**

"Don't Dump on Us" DSNI's first organizing campaign galvanized community residents to exert political pressure. The result was the closing of the area's illegal dumping facilities. What is a trash transfer station? When you put your garbage out on the street on Tuesday morning to be picked up by the Department of Public Works, the workmen load the trucks that then empty into a designated dump before the trash is buried in a landfill. Illegal dumps cater to construction contractors and rehabilitation specialists who also have to dump their refuse. These are not regulated dumps. DSNI's area has a plethora of both. Near the Dudley Triangle in back of St. Patrick's Church, the area is zoned for light industry. Trash transfer stations can do business here. Landowners in the area in the past would fence in property and charge to store garbage illegally. The smell and rats contributed to the area's low quality of life. Also the
trucks hauling garbage through the neighborhood created traffic problems. Trucks of all sizes from pickups to trailer trucks. What happens when the stations or closed or the dumpers don’t want to pay the price of dumping - the dump on the vacant land. The empty lots even today are littered with construction debris. At night the South End’s rehabilitation refuse found its way into Roxbury.

The Cape Verdean community drove the campaign to close the dumps. DSNI was the instrument through which they could muster community-wide support and a conduit to put pressure on the sanitation department and Mayor Flynn. It was the Mayor that personally padlocked the dumps after an extensive campaign and media action that included a threat by DSNI to cart garbage to City Hall.

What’s the planning issue here? The area became increasingly attractive once the dumps were closed. When the dumps were closed the residential property values rose. New neighborhood beautification campaigns would be born. The victory gave DSNI impetus and thrust the Cape Verdean homeowners into the core of its governing structure. The neighborhood betterment is an honorable goal. But because of housing discrimination (people of color are excluded from Boston neighborhoods, from South Boston, West Roxbury, Charlestown) where would these tenants move if they couldn’t afford to compete in a more attractive community? It seems perverse to propose that in order to afford housing, a roof over your head, one of the necessities is that a dump stay open, but this is reality. Here, those with the most resources gain from political action. Homeowners benefit from development in DSNI more than renters. Hence they participate more in the process.

Adalberto says that before DSNI was born in Roxbury, his community, the Cape Verdeans, were just beginning to organize themselves. But in the fight against the trash transfer stations, it was mostly individuals that lived near the dumps and these were new immigrants that didn't know their rights and mostly elderly people. They were basically leaderless, devoid both of individual leadership and institutional leadership. DSNI filled that void as a catalyst for change. It was the victories over the trash transfer stations that galvanized the community. Because individuals benefitted; they felt empowered by the closures.
The BRA’s and most community development organizations’ measures of a community’s strengths uses home ownership as one of its indicators. “Home ownership is seventy percent in X area...this must be good...” So in an area that has a high percentage of its residents as tenants, this may pit homeowners against tenants for control of the planning organizations. This is where we really became a bit adversarial. I gave her an example of the organization being perceived as home-ownership driven, where the community-organizing was initially conducted to close down trash-transfer stations for all the reasons that you should close down legal or illegal trash-transfer stations. But in a market-driven economy, the closing down of these operations benefit the homeowners in the area monetarily while making the area more attractive to higher priced renters that may then displace the people that live there because they couldn’t afford to live anywhere else. Her retort was brilliant. Measuring benefit on a monetary scale alone won’t do. “Just to take your example,” she said, “one step further. Picture the family in the Orchard Park Projects that keeps its windows closed in the scorching heat of the summer or be nauseated by the stench of the garbage in these dumps. When we organized them and the homeowners and everybody else around the areas to close these operations, they can then open their windows and enjoy some fresh air. They benefit also.”

- Andrea Nagel, Director of Human Development, DSNI

DSNI: ORGANIZING FOR LAND CONTROL: THE PROCESS

In the early to mid 80’s, Boston’s downtown development and real estate boom exerted tremendous pressure for development in Roxbury, threatening to displace the entire community. The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative was incorporated in 1984 as an instrument through which residents of Roxbury and North Dorchester could control this imminent development. To accomplish their goal of building affordable housing and in order to stem the onslaught of “gentrification,” DSNI members, board, and staff realized that they needed to own the land. To this end, DSNI’s board instructed its staff to investigate and pursue the legal process outlined in MGL 121A, eminent domain. Because half of the vacant land in the Dudley Triangle was City-owned, it could easily be developed through various City programs for example PFD’s 747. The other half, however, was privately owned, mostly by absentee land-owners. These lots impeded DSNI from facilitating the development of large projects because they were
dispersed throughout the area, creating a checkerboard effect. Eminent domain power would give DSNI the ability to take the private lots, making largescale development feasible.

The process by which DSNI discovered eminent domain has been the fuel for rumors and various stories.

There are two stories to the origin of eminent domain, and both are noteworthy in that they are rumors. There is no documentation, which actually points to the *oral tradition* in the indigenous planning paradigm. Policy comes out of people's ideas and is implemented. The trail is lost in sound waves. “The first story says that Stephen Coyle, director of the BRA, suggested it to Peter Medoff, then director of DSNI, on an elevator ride in City Hall. The second is told by Paul Yelder: Rakeman, Sawyer and Brewster, DSNI’s law firm, instructed the DSNI board to propose that the BRA transfer its eminent domain power to DSNI. At a meeting with Stephen Coyle, before the board could propose it, he suggested it to them.” Now the question is, whose idea was DSNI’s eminent domain? Was it DSNI’s, by way of its legal counsel? Or Stephen Coyle’s as a way of his snatching neighborhood planning away from PFD through the BRA to DSNI?

Paul Yelder, Deputy Director, DSNI

I was hired and tasked by the board to direct DSNI’s community organizing in 1988. The board’s primary concern was the low participation rate of Latinos, particularly Puerto Ricans, in DSNI’s membership. Puerto Rican’s non-involvement was distressing to the board and staff because Puerto Ricans make up the majority in the DSNI area, and their projected population growth warranted an outreach strategy. I analyzed the past strategy: DSNI’s central meeting place was St. Patrick’s Catholic Church; it was not only the primary meeting location, but it was the only meeting location. I thought this centralization was the crux of the problem. Latinos, although historically Catholic, have recently instituted Protestant churches in communities across the U.S. At the forefront is the Pentecostal Church. I saw that by DSNI meeting at the Catholic church, it was excluding members of other churches and non-churchgoers.

---

During this time, Peter Medoff, Executive Director, and Gerry Simms, Development Director, met with me to plan an organizing campaign that would build support for the eminent domain campaign. I used this campaign as an opportunity to make the organizing strategy more inclusive. House meetings were the primary approach. In addition, I identified three possible meeting sites, through which DSNI's information could be more widely disseminated. These sites were: The Cardinal Medeiros Manor, a residence for the elderly; Jesus Helps Baptist Church; and St. Paul's Catholic Church. These sites were scattered across the DSNI geographic area and ringed DSNI's office. My strategy was initially met with inertia. St. Patrick's Church was the Cape Verdean membership's base and their support had been essential to DSNI's past organizing campaigns. Any disruption in the core base was seen by some members of the board and by Peter Medoff as negative.

Here again we have a situation in which the pressure to get things done serves to reduce the organization from one having democratic implications to one which functions as a device for the accomplishment of administrative tasks.16

Notwithstanding, I forged on because I realized that a wider participation in DSNI would be more beneficial to the overall community in the long run. Community organizing was DSNI's engine. It was paramount that as DSNI moved into a development phase, that a more inclusive outreach effort be undertaken.

I identified members within the area of the new sites and helped them organize community meetings. I also helped design a staff-board presentation regarding DSNI's development plans, including the need for eminent domain power and the application process to acquire it. From these meetings, there emerged a core group which evolved into the Land Control Action Committee. The organizing effort was fueled primarily by community volunteers, and they took on more and more of the movement's strategy and implementation.

In retrospect, my strategy to use the eminent domain process to expand DSNI's membership base could be seen as risky by the development staff and development-oriented board members. The core group at St. Patrick's could be used to support the eminent domain effort. But their support could be lost by bringing in possible opposition. There was opposition to eminent domain in the neighborhood, particularly among residents who owned vacant lots. At the presentations they were assured that DSNI would not take land owned privately by community residents. The target for DSNI's land takings would be absentee land owners. The presentations addressed the residents' questions and concerns. Support grew as board members and residents spearheaded the organizing and were primary actors at the meetings.

My role in this organizing endeavor is illustrated by Zald in his organizational analysis:

Should the worker be a technical specialist, knowledgeable in the specific problems of the community, or should he be a generalist, knowledgeable about how to relate to communities?

At least partly the answer depends on the extent to which the target group accepts and is committed to the purposes of the agency. To the extent that an organization's goals are accepted and its functions in a community understood, a specialist organization can most efficiently communicate information and methods that can be utilized by a target group. However, to the extent that members of a target group are suspicious of an agency, communication channels will be blocked. In such a situation a generalist will be required whose main job is to establish an organization - target group linkage. As that linkage is established, it then becomes possible to reintroduce specialists, now trading on the generalist's relations.17

I felt that it was more important to organize the community to address its collective needs than just for the support of the development plan. This required that the organizing be inclusive, not just "herding" those useful to getting the eminent domain plan approved. This created a problem, because our core supporters, the Cape Verdeans, may have felt threatened by the prospect of other groups coming into the process. These new groups would need to be "brought up

---

17 Mayer N. Zald, "Organizations as Polities."
to speed” on DSNI’s comprehensive plan. Wider support meant the need for a new information campaign. This would slow down the development process.

Democracy in administration rests upon the idea of broadening participation...it is necessary to inquire into the concrete meaning of such an unanalyzed abstraction as “participation.” In doing so, we shall have to distinguish between substantive participation, involving an actual role in the determination of policy, and mere administrative involvement...a critical analysis cannot overlook that pattern which simply transforms an unorganized citizenry into a reliable instrument for the achievement of administrative goals, and calls it “democracy.”

Although we increased DSNI’s membership to include more Latinos, more Blacks, more Whites, and more Cape Verdeans, in the end it was the homogenous Cape Verdeans from the original meeting site who came out in support for the eminent domain application at the BRA hearing. This was partly due to their building a political base, which is reflected in DSNI’s membership. Also, as an emerging economic force in the neighborhood, they stood to gain the most, so they organized and participated the most. This is confirmed by Mildred Daniels, Longtime Resident of Roxbury and DSNI Member:

“DSNI’s primary strategy is community organizing. Victories won through this strategy are likely to benefit those groups already organized or amenable to being organized. On the other hand, less organized or more difficult to organize groups would receive little benefit from DSNI’s accomplishments.” Mildred points to visible evidence for this. The economic development in the area seems to be driven and benefitting well-organized homogeneous groups.

Interview with Mildred Daniels

She echoes Selznick in that groups are more readily coopted if they have existing organizations to work through.

With their slogan, “Take a Stand, Own the Land,” DSNI’s Land Control Action Committee (comprised of DSNI’s most energetic members) began the campaign to inform the community

---

18 Selznick, p. 220.
regarding the chosen course. A show of strength and support was crucial to move the BRA and
Mayor to decide favorably on DSNI's 121A application.

Information was constantly made available to the residents and translated in Spanish and
Cape Verdean. Following the committee's strategy, residents inundated the media with
telephone calls and letters calling for support. The media was electrified and joined in with
special programs and articles in support of this historic movement. The neighborhood was on
center stage; the movement was infectious.

Canvassing the neighborhood with buttons, flyers, and bumper stickers they rallied the
community's support. It seems as though the whole community came out -- young and old, black
and white, Cape Verdean and Hispanic, male and female, from all walks of life. Carrying
placards and balloons they paraded festively to a pre-designated vacant lot. There the
Mayor, City councilors, community leaders, and media joined the community's gala spirit. It
was spectacular, effective--and by design.

This action was perfectly orchestrated by DSNI's Land Control Action Committee and staff
members-- my role was to coordinate and communicate, in essence to keep information flowing.
But it was the people--Che Madyun, Sister Sue, Julio Henriquez, Clary Santiago, and countless
others--whose involvement energized and drove the movement.

The DSNI board followed the process outlined in MGL 121A and submitted its application.
After a lengthy feasibility and impact study, the BRA scheduled a public hearing to determine
the application's merits. The legal and bureaucratic process dragged on for about nine months.

On the day of the public hearing around supper time, a bus full of the Triangle's diversity left
DSNI for the BRA boardroom. Community supporters, reporters, cameras, and more
importantly, families of all colors crowded into the BRA hearing room. The majority of that
group was the same core of Cape Verdean families that had pressured City officials to close
down the trash transfer stations. It was an overwhelming show of support and testimony for the unprecedented initiative. The BRA board was moved to grant the eminent domain authority, and subsequently, the Mayor signed the petition.

**THE DANCE: A COOPTATIVE PARTNERSHIP**

Selznick's hypothesis: Cooptation which results in an actual sharing of power will tend to operate informally...cooptation oriented toward legitimization or accessibility will tend to be effected through formal devices. 19 [DSNI/PFD in the Joint Disposition Committee process]

On November 10, 1988, the BRA, through its director, Stephen Coyle, formally transferred eminent domain power to DNI. As is written in the Regulatory Agreement between the two parties, the BRA consented to “formulation of a corporation to be known as ‘Dudley Neighbors, Incorporated,’ for the purpose of carrying out the project described by the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative in its application for eminent domain.” Here, the BRA bows out from the dance and the Public Facilities Department (PFD) enters it through a partnership with DNI. On January 24, 1990, Lisa G. Chapnick, Director of PFD, signed a Memorandum of Understanding between DNI and the City of Boston’s Public Facilities Commission (PFC). This legal document in effect married DNI and PFD in the development of the Dudley area. DNI and PFD have committed joint resources to establish a developer designation and property disposition process in the Dudley Triangle. The partnership was legally initiated by DSNI through its application to the BRA for eminent domain, in which DSNI explicitly proposed to work with the City of Boston through its Public Facilities Commission. The process by which these two entities would work together in the development of the Dudley Triangle was established in the: “Memorandum of Understanding between Dudley Neighbors, Inc. and The

---

City of Boston Public Facilities Commission,” January, 1990. Some salient excerpts from that document follow:

1. **Creation of the Joint Disposition Committee:** Decisions concerning the disposition of property owned by DNI and the City in the Chapter 121A Project Area will be made through a Joint Committee (Joint Disposition Committee). This Joint Disposition Committee will be made up of four DNI designees and four City (PFD) designees. “These decisions will include but may not be limited to: identification of development parcels within the area for disposition, agreement on the contents of Request for Proposals, and selection of developers. Developer designation regarding lots owned by the City must be reviewed and approved by the PFC.”

2. **DNI’s accountability:** “Decisions concerning the acquisition of property by eminent domain will be made by DNI. PFC will exercise direct oversight of such acquisitions as follows. DNI will provide quarterly reports to PFC which shall set forth (1) a list of all parcels concerning which eminent domain proceedings have been commenced in the last quarter and the estimated cost of each taking; (2) a list of all parcels acquired in the last quarter by eminent domain and the cost of each taking; (3) a list of all parcels concerning which DNI expects to commence eminent domain proceedings within the next quarter and the estimated cost of each taking; (4) a summary of current and threatened litigation regarding eminent domain takings. Said quarterly reports shall be in addition to and not in lieu of the annual report to PFC by the Regulatory Agreement between DNI and the BRA.”

3. **Affordability guidelines:** “PFC has established a threshold affordability level of 51% low and moderate income units of total new units built. For the purposes of this Agreement, “low income” and “moderate income” mean households whose annual income is at 50% or less and 80% or less, respectively, of the Boston SMSA median income adjusted for family size. DSNI has a higher affordability goal of 40% low income and 30% moderate income. The achievement of this higher affordability level will depend on identification of financial resources not currently available to the City of Boston. DNI and the City will use their best efforts to identify and obtain the financial resources needed to meet these guidelines.”

4. **Time constraints imposed by City through PFC:** “Land which is acquired through the Chapter 121A process to be combined with City-owned land must be advertised or designated for development within two years from the date title transfers to DNI. If such action is not taken, the City will either: (a) exercise its right of possession as mortgagee, if funds provided by the City are used for land acquisition or, (b) have a first option to purchase the property at the acquisition cost plus actual interest paid.”

---

This is the cooptative mechanism, whereby PFD and DSNI are married in a new administrative entity called the Joint Disposition Committee (1. above). The City can impose its control on DSNI and, depending on the perspective, both organizations benefit.

There are parallels in Selznick's study, a government planning and implementation group, in this case BRA/PFD, needs a community organization through which to carry out its program. By creating an administrative mechanism, in this case the DSNI/PFD Joint Disposition Committee. The process through which this is carried out is the cooptative mechanism, as Selznick postulates. The City can then draw on DSNI to administer and carry out its development plans for Roxbury. Why? The city of Boston needed to expand its tax base. Policy makers chose to bring on line the city's vast resource of vacant land, most of which is in Roxbury. In order to accomplish this, a master plan was needed. The BRA, as the city planning organization, undertook this task and after completing the notorious Dudley Plan, the city moved into the implementation stage. The mayor moved to establish a partnership by marrying DSNI to PFD. Through the use of the partnership the city could: 1. Carry out revenue base increase and 2. Stop the separatist Mandela incorporation project.

on the timeline for development that is causing stress between DSNI and PFD, as expressed by Gus Newport, Executive Director of DSNI. Pat stated that PFD's timeline emanates from the Mayor's public commitment to develop the 747 empty lots owned by the City by 1990. He promised it when running for re-election.

- Pat McGuigan, Deputy Director, PFD

Failure to reflect the true balance of power will necessitate a realistic adjustment to those centers of institutional strength which are in a position to strike organized blows and thus to enforce concrete demands. This issue may be met by the kind of cooptation which results in an actual sharing of power.21

The actual sharing of power may be evident in the makeup of the Joint Disposition Committee, which calls for equal representation by PFD and DSNI.

History of DSNI

just like in a marriage. Both groups have really tried. But this is really a new phenomenon - sharing of power, information, decision-making - is new. And there is the issue of trust. DSNI, which has been in a predominantly disenfranchised neighborhood and PFD, which is mostly staffed by whites. In addition, the separatist movement of incorporating Roxbury into its own City, Mandela, all this would seem to get in the way. But the partnership continues because of commitment.

- Pat McGuigan, Deputy Director, PFD

Note the constraints implicit in the memorandum of understanding. The timeline for development in 3. above clearly sets up a power relationship with control by PFD.

1991 construction date for first phase development of the Dudley Triangle is good and that’s why PFD is pushing Sister Sue’s development on Magnolia Street, which is in the DSNI core area, but not within the Triangle Project area.”

- Pat McGuigan, Deputy Director, PFD

The reporting mechanism in 2. above makes DSNI accountable to PFD, again upholding Selznick’s formal cooptation theory: The Joint Disposition Committee then becomes an administrative appendage of the City’s traditional land disposition mechanism process.

This could be the undoing of DSNI’s plan, this time constraint, because their funding sources aren’t really coming through for the total buildout and they’ve proposed to take a large tract of land. The danger here is that they may not have the funding to develop it and the land then reverts back to the City.

- Muhammed Salaam, BRA

Julio’s description of the dance started with his definition of partnership: A relationship wherein two or more entities communicate with a shared goal and an equal voice. In the current partnership with PFD, DSNI is a subordinate agent of City policy. The City is using DSNI as a smokescreen to foster its plans. Then, when the community bucks or rebels, City politicians and political advisors tell the community, “what’s the matter with you, we’re trying to help.” He said he had direct evidence of PFD’s control by excluding key members of the opposition of PFD/DSNI meetings.

- Julio Henriquez, Development Committee Member, DSNI

In order for this to be a successful partnership, the legitimate needs and concerns of DSNI should be acknowledged and respected by the other partner, PFD. But as in troubled marriages, a power relationship evolves with dominance and subjugation. “That’s not what I want to see.” In this relationship, power, control, and authority are central for going forward.

- Bruce Bolling, Boston City Councilor, Roxbury District
Linking the development of voluntary associations to substantive programs...affords an opportunity for the participation of local citizens in the administration of those programs. Random organization...as ends in themselves does not lend itself to that type of administrative partnership or involvement.²²

However, the need for a sense of legitimacy may require an adjustment to the people in their undifferentiated aspect, in order that a feeling of general acceptance may be developed. For this purpose, it may not be necessary actually to share power: the creation of a “front” or the open incorporation of accepted elements into the structure of the organization may suffice. In this way, an aura of respectability will be gradually transferred from the coopted elements to the organization as a whole, and at the same time a vehicle of administrative accessibility may be established.²³

Although the Memorandum of Understanding was signed by DSNI and PFD, bargaining continues on the main points. The most important of these is the timeline for development.

DSNI wants to develop on its pace. PFD, on the other hand, is driven by political forces.

PFD has been tasked to accomplish the Mayor’s 747 agenda. When PFD became a partner of DSNI, PFD demanded that the partnership stick to the 747 timeline. “I know that DSNI wants to renegotiate, but a deal is a deal!

- Pat McGuigan, Deputy Director, PFD

A practitioner has to be aware of the fact that partnerships have constraints on both sides and that the City of Boston could not give DSNI the power to develop all this City acreage without some controls. Radical analysis would say that these controls would spell failure for the development. A practitioner would say that these are practical controls to ensure public good. Although he does agree with some of the radical perspective, he says that it’s not as black and white as a theoretician may propose. He said also that the community has not accepted carte blanche the regulatory agreement that calls for a certain timeline within which to develop, but has continually petitioned and is now in the process of appealing this timeline, so that development matches the community’s vision.

- Gus Newport, Executive Director, DSNI

Assuming that funds for community development the bulk of which emanates from the federal government requires community participation, the Joint Disposition Committee would act as an

administrative vehicle through which the City could satisfy that requirement. In this view, the cooptative mechanism - in this instance the Joint Disposition Committee - is a vehicle for community development in Roxbury *from the top down*, in essence, using DSNI to occupy an administrative function in the City’s development process.

In the following model, I simplify the instruments by which the cooptative mechanism is used. Initially, the BRA grants DSNI its eminent domain power through A Regulatory Agreement. Through the Memorandum of Understanding, DSNI marries PFD. This marriage is consumated through the creation of an administrative appendage, the Joint Disposition Committee, which will designate property and choose the developers to develop the land in DSNI’s Triangle Project.
Motive: City

After DSNI presented its DAC Plan to the City, its acceptance could be the vehicle by which Mayor Flynn would achieve his populist ambitions in Roxbury. DSNI’s land control movement, if not coopted, would be a threat to the City’s organizational needs. Assuming that these needs are political, the election of the Mayor is paramount. Hence, a mechanism is devised whereby DSNI as an existing organization can be used to administer the city’s plan. The BRA would assist DSNI in acquiring eminent domain power over privately owned land.
In 1989, the Joint Disposition Committee designated the developers for Phase One in the Triangle Project. Pat strongly points out to me that “nothing has been built.” It is important for the reader to note that Pat stresses that the Mayor, who personally pushed for DSNI’s eminent domain power, has a four year timeline: “Short term success...The Mayor showed a personal commitment to DSNI and DSNI should take advantage of the Mayor’s commitment because someone else, if elected, can walk away from the contract.” He underlined this by stressing that it was the Mayor that pressured the BRA Commission to accept DSNI’s application for eminent domain. And that the fallout has been the replacing of some of those Commissioners with more politically correct individuals. “If in 1993, we haven’t built anything, we have failed. All the talk and talk and planning. We have failed because PFD, by legal structure and mandate, is an implementation agency.” He agreed with DSNI on what should be built in Dudley, but he disagreed on not going forward unless there is a complete plan. “This can be dangerous.”

- Pat McGuigan, Deputy Director, PFD

The ensuing marriage to PFD in the disposition of land in the Triangle Project would effectively make DSNI part of the city’s administrative process in the development of the Dudley Area. Furthermore, the BRA would be able to carry out a plan that, because of the urban renewal debacle in the West End, and the South End’s gentrification, it could not.

it [BRA] may lack a sense of historical legitimacy. [the BRA’s infamous urban renewal displacement]...or be unable to mobilize the community for action. [participation as part of the process, as stipulated in CBDG funding criteria, which calls for design review]24

For example, during the South End’s confrontation of the BRA’s displacement plan (urban renewal) the people organized and they wanted to be included in the urban renewal plan itself. Some may call this a success, but when we look back, this approach was only able to wrest one small piece of that valuable real estate for community benefit. DSNI is trying to build on the successes and failures of the South End’s organizing efforts, in other words, not just to be included in the plan, but how to control the planning process, so that they can build the community for themselves.

- Gus Newport, Executive Director, DSNI

---

24 Selznick, p. 259-60.
MOTIVE: DSNI

DSNI's primary organizational need stems from its explicit goals of building affordable housing and stopping displacement in the Dudley area. The City, through the BRA and PFD, legitimate plan-makers and implementors in Roxbury was a direct threat to DSNI because of the perception of displacement and disruption to their community. In order to fulfill its goal of land control, DSNI would coopt the city into its governing structure. Through eminent domain, the City would be brought into DSNI through the PFD/DSNI partnership. This partnership would ensure that DSNI's plans would be fulfilled.

And the outcome is inevitable, whether DSNI builds the complete community according to the community's plan, or somebody else builds the community according to the DAC plan, which has been institutionalized in the City's zoning code for Roxbury.

- Gus Newport, Executive Director, DSNI

This elicits an important question: At what point does cooptation turn into cooperation and is there a concept of "benign cooptation?" Let me explain: without the City, DSNI would have to expend its resources to acquire the vacant land, making it more dependent upon charitable contributors, whose whims might change. In aligning itself with PFD, DSNI would be less dependent on charitable contributors for the acquisition of land, making them less dependent on contributors, albeit more dependent on the City.

The foundations need to see that their investments are sound, but they also want to appear to the public to be socially aware. Through this site visit, the Ford Foundation will investigate the strength of the partnership. They will ask questions about DSNI's subordinate role. They will be asking the question up front and in person.

- Julio Henriquez, Development Committee Member, DSNI
FUNDING SOURCES AND INFLUENCE

In this section I show how DSNI’s funding is contingent upon the partnership. This sets up DSNI as dependent upon City resources. More detailed information about funding sources is provided in Appendix II.

But as in troubled marriages, a power relationship evolves with dominance and subjugation. “That’s not what I want to see.” In this relationship, power, control, and authority are central for going forward...in the power-control dynamic, who controls the planning and the decision-making, which ultimately translates to simple resource allocation.

Bruce Bolling, Boston City Councilor, Roxbury District

SOURCES OF FUNDING

The BRA receives its revenue from ground lease fees on property it owns, for example, Charlestown Navy Yard, and Faneuil Hall Marketplace. Both of these projects follow the BRA’s *modus operandus*: developing a public project as an oasis that then fuels adjacent private development. It also receives funding from the federal government for special development contracts (e.g. planning around development projects such as the Central Artery Depression, amounts not divulged by Muhammed Salaam in our interview). In addition, the BRA has the legal authority to float municipal bonds, which in the last two years it has not done. The BRA’s funding levels for years 1990-1991 held constant at approximately $22M and $25M.

PFD has three primary sources of funds: federal, state, and city. The federal government targets Boston through CDBGs. This funding and other federal programs for which PFD is a conduit, total $15.3M for 1991. In addition to federal money, PFD receives state money through the EOCD ($18.5M) and other funds from the City’s linkage program which taxes private
developed and targets those revenues to neighborhoods through PFD ($7.6M). Total amount from these three sources projected for 1991, $41.5M.\textsuperscript{25}

DSNI receives its primary funding from private foundations. The Ford Foundation has committed $2M in a program-specific loan to acquire private land. The Riley Foundation and other private charities contribute funds for DSNI's day to day operations. Total private contributions (not including in-kind) were $222K in 1988, $175K in 1989, and $350K in 1990. DSNI receives in-kind contributions, such as legal and technical assistance, from private organizations, at a value of $58K in 1988 and approximately $200K in 1989. DSNI also receives funding from the state's EOCD ($32K in 1988, $78K in 1989, $100K in 1990), and City funds from the PFD's MAP/TAP program which support administrative positions in development ($75K in 1989 and $70K in 1990).

PFD has given $229 thousand between 1989 and 1990 in grants, most recently a 1991 grant for $84 thousand from the Management Assistance Program for staff support. The constraints on this money are that it be used for development activities, land acquisition, and marketing for Dudley Neighbors, Incorporated (DNI), which will be the land trust. Concomitantly, this grant supports the development director's salary and DNI's director's salary.

- Gus Newport, Executive Director, DSNI

\textbf{EFFECTS OF THE INTERACTION ON FUNDING}

The interaction does not influence the funding level of either city agency. The BRA receives no foundation grants or any other monies tied to its relationship with DSNI. PFD's funding level is not affected either. PFD's primary funding source is CDBGs, through which it supports neighborhood development, including the DSNI project. However, PFD does derive some benefit from the relationship that could be translated monetarily, for example, DSNI's DAC Plan is the blueprint that is being used to build the community. Consequently, PFD has not had

\textsuperscript{25} Interview with Harold Raymond, Neighborhood Planner, PFD.
to expend its planning resources. Also DSNI’s participatory process has enabled the City, through PFD, to implement a plan that it alone would not be able to put in place, and at minimal cost and although not a monetary benefit, PFD needs citizen participation as a prerequisite to its CDBG funding; DSNI serves this function.

On the other hand, the city’s involvement with DSNI is crucial to DSNI’s funding level. For example, the Ford Foundation looks to the partnership with PFD and BRA as a strength. In the recent DSNI funding cycle, according to Muhammed Salaam, the BRA wrote a letter of support for DSNI to the Ford Foundation, which stated that the BRA would be flexible in its zoning requirements for DSNI’s building implementation. As DSNI’s primary land-acquisition funding source, the Ford Foundation’s involvement is critical to DSNI’s affordability guidelines (they underwrite the cost of the private land). Through the letter, the BRA assured the Ford Foundation that it would accept DSNI’s development plans without undue zoning restrictions. The BRA staff would simply notify the BRA Commission of the revisions due to extenuating circumstances, such as financial constraints that may warrant a divergence from the original development plan. That letter of support was meant to assure the Ford Foundation of a healthy partnership between DSNI and the City.

Furthermore, the partnership with PFD benefits DSNI economically in the following ways: Fifty percent of the land in the Triangle Project was city land; it has been ceded through PFD to DSNI. Although substantial, the exact value is not available presently.

All the empty land in that area was acquired through foreclosure and owned by some public agency. Because Roxbury was not an urban renewal area, the BRA could not acquire land by eminent domain. He wondered which agency was capable of making a difference here. During this time, NDEA was absorbed into PFD. Lisa Chapnick takes over. In another corner of Roxbury, DSNI is born.

Because the PFD in its structure cannot take land through eminent domain unless they’re going to build municipal buildings. By pushing DSNI to acquire private land through eminent domain and assemble it with the PFD-owned public land, they become partners and a controlling factor in the development of Roxbury - getting back a piece of the pie. (they had to keep themselves necessary)
PFD has committed $4.5M to subsidize construction costs for the duration of DSNI’s comprehensive plan in direct grants to developers, who are chosen through the Joint Disposition Committee process. Moreover, through the Management and Technical Assistance Program (MAP/TAP), PFD directly funds DSNI’s development director and deputy director’s salaries (at least $70K in 1990).

When DSNI and PFD in partnership (Joint Disposition Committee) choose a private developer to develop a targeted parcel within the Triangle Project area, the private developer may receive some state subsidies through creative finance schemes that may include tax deferments. The prospective homebuyer, on the other hand, may be eligible for Nehemiah (federal) and MHFA (state). These low interest loans and grants are designed for first-time homebuyers, to drive down the initial cost of home ownership. This funding conduit illustrates the benefits to DSNI residents who are able to purchase homes.

In addition, PFD, as an implementation organization for the city, assists DSNI members in acquiring amenities that heighten the quality of life in the neighborhood, for example, they help community groups plan and bring to fruition tot lots, community gardens, neighborhood cleanups, etc. In short, through the partnership, PFD acts as a conduit of City resources to the DSNI area.

through this relationship PFD acts as a conduit for City resources. We discussed the dynamic of control of the development process exerted through PFD’s control of resources. He said “that’s the price of democracy, which may slow the process down, but in the participatory process, you have more people (institutions or individuals) adding their advice on decisions made.”

- Adalberto Teixeira, Coordinator of Neighborhood Services, City of Boston
I attempt to show by the following diagram the route by which funding for DSNI's community development travels and, assuming that money wields influence and control, I also attempt to show the route by which that influence may be brought to bear on the community.

**Sources of Funding and Influence**

**Acronyms:**
- BRA  Boston Redevelopment Authority
- CDBG  Community Development Block Grant
- DSNI  Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative
- EDIC  Economic Development Industrial Commission
- EOCD  Executive Office of Community Development
- HOP  Housing Opportunity Program
- HUD  Housing and Urban Development
- MHFA  Massachusetts Housing and Finance Agency
- PFD  Public Facilities Department
The federal government, under the Reagan Administration, used CDBGs as the program by which it involved itself in community development. Currently, CDBGs are targeted to the City of Boston and administered through the PFD. In addition to federal money, PFD receives some state money through the EOCD and other funds from the City's linkage program which taxes private developers and targets those revenues to neighborhoods through PFD.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I told DSNI's history as interpreted through Selznick's cooptation lens. DSNI can be seen as an extension of the City's administrative process for community development. Further, I have presented the formal mechanism by which DSNI has been included into the City's designs and shown that by virtue of time constraints on development and reporting mechanism to the City, DSNI is subjugated in the partnership. Using funding sources as evidence of pressures on DSNI to accept the conditions of the partnership, I have answered the question, "why would DSNI involve itself in a seemingly powerless position?" The preceding evidence points to mutual benefit derived from the cooptation, City agencies use the mechanism to implement their development plans and DSNI uses the mechanism to infuse their goals into the process and to also acquire more funding from their charitable contributors, raising the question: at what point is cooptation cooperation?
CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS:
DSNI'S STORY AS COOPTATIVE PROCESS

ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS

Here I explain the question, “Who coopted whom?” Using Selznick’s cooptative mechanism, I address this question from two perspectives: the BRA’s and DSNI’s. First, the BRA saw DSNI as a threat to its Dudley Plan and moved to bind the emerging organization in a formal contract. This formal cooptation legally constructed a conduit by which the BRA would continue to carry out its planning mandate in Roxbury. Second, DSNI, after having commissioned the DAC Plan, saw that the existing institutional structure, within which the BRA operated, would impede its goals of land control. To get around this, it petitioned the BRA for eminent domain. The legal contract would assure that threats to its goals would be minimized by including the City, through PFD, in its governing structure.

The first story says that Stephen Coyle, director of the BRA, suggested it to Peter Medoff, then director of DSNI, on an elevator ride in City Hall. The second is told by Paul Yelder in a story he tells that after being instructed by DSNI law firm Rakeman, Sawyer and Brewster to propose that the BRA transfer its eminent domain power to the DSNI board. At a meeting with Stephen Coyle, before they could propose it, he suggested it to them. Now the question is, whose idea was DSNI’s eminent domain powers to develop private and public land in the Dudley triangle? Was it DSNI, by way of its legal counsel? Or Stephen Coyle’s by way of his snatching neighborhood planning away from PFD to DSNI through the BRA? Because up until this point, PFD was still the neighborhood planning organization. Following the Mayor’s neighborhood populism, Stephen Coyle’s career ambitions necessitated that he become the neighborhood planner and DSNI served that purpose.

- Paul Yelder, Deputy Director, DSNI

The next section draws heavily on Mayer N. Zald’s “Organizations as Polities: An Analysis of Community Organization Agencies.” When trying to figure out why an organization such as
DSNI, PFD, or BRA acts in a certain way, it's important to get a handle on the basic makeup of that organization. Zald presents a framework for doing just that. According to Zald, the BRA and PFD function as external service-oriented institutions, which means that they don't have a membership and their basic function is to provide a public service. In the case of PFD, to maintain public buildings. In the case of the BRA, to be the planning arm of the city. Service organizations offer services to individuals rather than attempting to change them.

However, when in partnership with DSNI, their collective ideology is shifted to a change-oriented member organization. Agencies that mobilize people to change society and its institutions are change-oriented. The membership being the actual beneficiaries of the partnership's community development outcome. DSNI, on the other hand, is a social-change oriented institution. Because as its base it has a membership, according to Zald, this is an internal institution. Examples he gives are regional planning groups for specific areas. But on another level, DSNI also functions as a non-member institution. It exemplifies a movement for land control by a distinct social class. This goes beyond the membership boundary. In this respect, DSNI is a hybrid organization. It doesn't fit Zald's traditional organizational analysis.

**ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS**

PFD and BRA’s organization needs stem from their place in Boston’s political structure. Mayor Flynn’s populist ambitions and neighborhood mayor image drive the BRA and other city agencies. As planning organizations, positive community development projects carried through by BRA or PFD would reflect favorably on the Mayor.

**The Mayor's Role:** When DSNI filed its application to the BRA for eminent domain, the BRA staff, including Director Stephen Coyle, were enthusiastic. But the BRA Commissioners were generally opposed. It took pressure from Mayor Flynn to get these people to abandon their opposing positions.
But Flynn needs to send a message to his people (PFD) to slow down the development timeline, and also to put more resources behind DSNI. The Mayor is exerting a lot of control over this development in Roxbury.

- Gus Newport, Executive Director, DSNI

DSNI's land control movement, if not coopted, would be a threat to the City's organizational needs. Assuming that these needs are political, the election of the Mayor is paramount. The City, through the BRA and PFD, legitimate plan-makers and implementors in Roxbury, was a direct threat to DSNI because of the perception of displacement and disruption to their community.

**IDEOLOGY**

Unlike Selznick I have found that an organization's ideology is not just another defense response like the cooptative mechanism, but in fact a primary driving force in the relationship. The BRA/PFD are planning organizations structured into City government. Consequently, its inherent ideology may be traditional: planning is primarily a government function. In this ideology DSNI is seen as part of the city, another of its neighborhoods under their jurisdiction. DSNI can and should be used to administer the city's plan. By including DSNI into its structure the city can be assured of citizen participation resulting in a more readily accepted plan. In this perspective the BRA/PFD staff may adhere to the "City Beautiful" tenets and Roxbury can be seen as another neighborhood in a larger more integrated plan.

"Ideologically, we don't have to be the next South End. But we shouldn't be the next South Bronx. The community is demanding more people, more housing, and this means new people." When I asked him what he saw as the community, he said it was wrong to keep people out of the Roxbury area. We should encourage the middle-class to move into Roxbury. "The people in the area need jobs and the young people need role models, they need to provide for themselves. You can't have a community of poor single women, for example, old Columbia Point. That's why we needed a mixed income project."

- Pat McGuigan, Deputy Director, PFD
Another divergence from Selznick is that in this relationship overlapping ideologies may drive both the coopting and coopted organizations. For example, in this case, a better City and a higher quality of life in the DSNI neighborhood may be the overlapping ideologies that may point to the relationship benefitting both agents.

DSNI's organizing ideology harmonizes with the City's, connecting quite diverse issues as: revenue-base expansion, the Mayor's reelection, and DSNI's social change, all under the banner of community development and citizen participation. Organizing in Roxbury achieves a higher quality of life for DSNI residents and at the same time may bring the blighted land on line. Contrary to Selznick's theory I propose that an organizations ideology plays a larger part in the types of relationships it enters, and the outcomes from those relationships can be seen as positive. In this case DSNI's constituency may need to develop low cost home ownership opportunities which may drives the organization into a partnership with PFD, even though the relationship may drive up the cost to the area's renters in the long run. The benefitting constituency (in this case, homeowners) may change the initial ideology through control of the governance structure of the organization from one of social change to one of serving their interests.
CONSEQUENCES

THE NON-MULTIPLIER EFFECT

This is not the main focus of this research, but it is a secondary finding I came across through document analysis and talking with many interested and interesting people.

Roxbury's ethnography and demographics have been used at least as far back as the early 1960s to funnel federal money to Boston. For example, Boston's planners would write a proposal for CDBG monies to build affordable housing in a district in Roxbury, let's say the Sav-Mor district. In order for the City to be eligible for the money, the people in its target and surrounding areas would need to fit a poverty profile under federal guidelines, because the funds emanate from the "War on Poverty" ideology. These proposals carry funds for proposal writers, planners, and administrators even before the implementation stage. But let's get to the implementation stage. And for the sake of clarity, let's keep it simple simple.

Take one unit constructed in Roxbury to benefit a low income family. Once the family moves in, of course that family benefits from planning, funding and implementation. But if we look closer, we also see the invisible beneficiaries: developers, lawyers, architects, planners, program administrators, builders, contractors, building supply companies, construction workers, and others. Now over time, Roxbury residents have not been able to get any of these jobs. As a matter of fact, they have not even been able to get the non-skilled jobs as construction laborers. No training to get the skilled construction jobs and other positions generated, they have been systematically locked out of the union hall at every level.

The result is that this one family that moves into this one unit is the source of economic benefit exported to communities outside of Roxbury. These beneficiaries don't live in Roxbury. Many
don't even live in Boston. They take their salaries and their profits with them at five o'clock. The net result is that this one unit in Roxbury is providing money to other communities. The extent to which Roxbury's poverty is being used in other communities as a multiplier effect for their development, lends itself to further research.

The people within the community are the same as far back as I can remember. The need for implementation is just as dire. But there is a sense of optimism in the air. New stores have sprung up on Dudley Street. Not just your run of the mill store, either. These seem to be well-financed, well-designed and not the flighty, ill-conceived non-creative entrepreneurial schemes of the past. If economic development is the first building block to a comprehensive community development plan, then this is a positive sign. On the other hand, if the market has driven the comprehensive plan to institute its icons of progress (small businesses, market-driven enterprises) at the expense of community-building, resource-sharing, housing development and other transformative efforts, then this portends material consumption as a driving force to community development. Is this an outcome inevitable of DSNI's private/public linkage? Or is this the entrepreneurial spirit taking advantage of community organizing and positioning itself to reap benefits. Why is this poignant? Because DSNI's community organizing force is now in the forefront of its economic development. What are the implications?

I saw the children today. The children that I saw as a community organizer and invited to participate with us at DSNI. They are starting to understand that DSNI is theirs. They are starting to really feel that they are the organization. I saw them come in, and to my dismay I found that I had very little time to acknowledge and communicate with them because of this thesis and the time constraint that I have to complete it. I am now the conformer. I am now an echo. I felt lost in those very structures (in my case, credentialism) that I earlier commented on with disdain.
There are a lot of decision-makers, representatives, leaders, that have a part to play in the community development game. Some of these individuals start out with altruistic commitments. But they walk into structures: Boston Politics, and the Statehouse Legislative Process, fledgling organizers falling into bureaucratization a form of cooptation. The structures that they walk into have been historically designed for the status quo. i.e., they are designed to survive and succeed in the existing social-political-economic context, playing according to the established norms.

Case in point: I tried and tried to reach the executive directors and those that represent this community - all in vain. Not because they didn’t care about me as a community member and constituent but because the bureaucratic behavior that they had stepped into removed them from the grassroots, effectively curtailing communication between the institutions that they now are part of and the people that they represent. While they are being distracted by the existing bureaucratic structures that they walk into, while they are acquiring and conforming to offices and appointment books, the band plays on and the dance continues.

I saw something else: The visions exist, even here. On West Cottage Street, my street, right there’s a petition for a longtime resident to reach his dream on his land. The petition goes from the BRA zoning board (the traditional channel) and mailed to his abutters. It outlines his proposed development which requires a zoning variance and asks for support or opposition. Across the street, his neighbor signs in support, even though the proposal (a car repair shop) will lower his property’s value; a show of solidarity, a show of valuing his neighbor’s vision, his dream. I asked him, if he understood the outcome of his neighbor’s proposal and the necessary consent. He said, “yes, but I want to support him in what he wants to do.”

On Dudley and West Cottage Street, a new restaurant is born, El Jagua, it will probably win design awards. And these people built it themselves, the Dominicans. They even built the chairs and tables, it’s fantastic. The Pentecostal pastor, a member of DSNI’s board, is still
trying to get parking for his flock, adamantly opposed by the dry cleaner owner, who sees him as a threat encroaching on his long term power in the area. He also wanted that land to expand his business. They have both worked with and through DSNI as an appendage of the Cities zoning process. The good and the bad. Together and apart. Partners.

DSNI is really having growing pains today. It's caught between advocating for the needs of the community, and when that's not enough, actually providing services. For instance, the residents have a dire need for educational and recreational programs for their youth. Through organizing - DSNI's main instrument for community development - the organization's staff has come into contact with many of these young people. DSNI has had to create educational and recreational programs because of the lack of the same in Roxbury.

This can create some potential problems, because the organization is not mandated to provide human services, and if the staff's time is taken up with providing these services, their energy is diverted from community organizing and community development work. What does the staff do? Well, it tries to refer the young people to the various agencies in the area. But due to budget cuts, most of the educational and recreational programs in the area no longer exist or are over-enrolled. The young people in DSNI also own the organization. This is evident in a young architect's group who worked with student architects from MIT in designing a community center. By mandate DSNI is pressed to include their visions in the final proposal. Andrea Nagel, human services planning director, coordinated the young architects' program, filling two needs: 1. The need for young people to be involved in planning their community and 2. To give interested and gifted young people an opportunity to explore new horizons. She is, on the one hand, doing community development work, and on the other hand providing a human service.

In addition, residents have come to the bilingual staff for help in translating letters and legal documents. The staff takes on the work of legal services organizations, which have been
severely cut and eroded through federal and state cutbacks. So again, the staff is inundated with the day-to-day needs of the client population and is continually straddling between community development and providing human services.

I don’t see this problem getting any better until the residents receive the services they need from the human service agencies mandated to provide them. This means that DSNI may have to take on a more pro-active advocacy role for its residents or have to curtail some community development work to help their members survive day-to-day.

Mel King says that Roxbury in particular and communities of color in general are non-profit driven, causing dependency. I’m not advocating for-profit or market-driven community services, but I think that a community should reap from the harvest of its work. For example, a community development organization sows the seeds that should reap a harvest in a more competent community - that’s the profit - not profit in a monetary sense: But if the community then, because of its need for human services, uses these organizations on a dependency model, the outcome is more dependency. I see DSNI struggling with this very issue of non-profit human service provision and the specter of building a dependent community. I think it should listen to Paul Yelder, Deputy Director, when he says that a positive outcome for DSNI would be “that the community no longer needs it, that it works itself out of a job, phases out.” By providing human services to the residents, this will never happen. By creating dependency it perpetuates the need for those services.

**WINNERS AND LOSERS**

In order to navigate a course to a better place, first we must see where we’re at. Like a human being, an organization can not become static. Ceasing to change, inertia and rigidity set in, the outcome is inevitable; clinging to familiar patterns of behavior, archaic institutions slide into the slippery slope of survivalist ideology. Social change movements, are just about that,
change. As the environment fluctuates within which social change organizations exist, new strategies for transformative development must arise. These new strategies find fertile ground, not only on yesterdays victories, but also on sound theory and practical experience. Community organizers must be about creating new institutions and institutional relationships that adapt to unforeseen and uncontrollable forces such as: shifting political ideologies, social malaise, economic restructuring and hardship, and general societal instability.

Caring, sheltering and developing transformative communities are honorable objectives, but the processes through which they are met must be flexible and sensitive to those of us most vulnerable. With understanding and patience born of wisdom the outcome will be a more cooperative, supportive, competent and humane society.

The DSNI/PFD partnership can be see as a reaction to those very forces mentioned above, and as such, is it time to re-evaluate the chosen course? Yes! A given strategy or course is apt to have a higher probability of success when rigorous evaluation is part of the agenda. Without an evaluation course the partnership is bound to flounder. Some of the questions that should be answered as to the viability of the relationship are the following:

Could both parties be using each other or mutual benefit? Does benign cooptation mean giving up a little bit of something to get more of something else? For example, is DSNI giving up a larger land control movement in Roxbury for the possibility of building a community in the Dudley Triangle? If the outcome benefits both agents in the cooptation, is this cooperation? Once coopted, is the relationship stable? Can it evolve? Can it continue to benefit both agents.

**CONFLICT, TIME, AND SPACE**

In this partnership time and space are important. The development process has within it intricate time lines. For example, land acquisition and conventional financing have very
explicit closing dates which must be adhered to. More importantly, in the interaction between the City and DSNI, eminent domain carries definite time constraints to develop, with penalties to DSNI for non-compliance.

There are costs and benefits to both delaying and expediting the buildout plan. On the one hand, the partnership can be judged a success if “shovels turn some dirt. While on the other, the resulting development may be inappropriate. Here time-constraints on development translate into control. The City controls the relationship by having imposed time lines that benefit its primary goals (elections and revenue base expansion). The constraints pressure DSNI into building inappropriately, as opposed to building patiently. The community originally bargained for good affordable housing with anti-displacement measures (in essence, land control). The time constraints explicit in the binding agreement may curtail or preclude this end of the bargain.

The imposed time line benefits public officials who are driven by the mayor’s re-election bid. Any development however shortsighted would reflect favorably on his administration (we’ve built something in these hard times). Moreover, any development in the Triangle would benefit homeowners by raising property values with which they could leverage loans for home improvements, cars, and financing education. The City also benefits by taxing property at a higher value, thereby expanding its revenue stream.

Space is also important, because its development would benefit the area’s small businesses and homeowner community, who controls the Triangle; it is basically residential bounded by commercial and retail districts. Upon development the new residents would increase the demand for goods and services. The primary beneficiaries from inappropriate or patient development are the easiest to organize through DSNI and according to Selznick, the most amenable to enter into a cooptative relationship. The most able able to derive economic benefit from the build out, again, are the Cape Verdeans by virtue of their home ownership rate, and
their involvement in small business ventures which include a myriad of enterprises from office cleaning to advertising and radio.

Mildred also noted that DSNI's primary strategy is community organizing. Victories won through this strategy are likely to benefit those groups already organized or amenable to being organized. On the other hand, less organized or more difficult to organize groups would receive little benefit from DSNI's accomplishments. Mildred points to visible evidence for this. The economic development in the area seems to be driven and benefitting well organized homogeneous groups.

- Mildred Daniels, Longtime Resident of Roxbury and DSNI Member

In the BRA’s initial proposal for the Dudley Triangle, the president of 1st American Bank promised to underwrite any mortgage in the area, because the Cape Verdean community has all their savings in that bank. The BRA made strong efforts to include the Cape Verdean community for that very reason.

- Muhammed Salaam, BRA

It is interesting to note that the Cape Verdeans are the newest immigrant group in Roxbury. Their economic achievements can be attributed to their homogeneity and Catholicism; St. Patrick’s Church is the center of their community. Historically the Catholic Church has been proactive in anchoring its constituent community by entering into development strategies to mutual benefit. The Cape Verdean community has replaced the church’s Irish parishioners, long since gone during “suburbanization”. The Cape Verdeans have acted as natural developers in the DSNI area. Their example in organizing and community control should be emulated by other groups. How much of their expertise in development stems from their cultural values and not easily adopted remains to be seen. Regardless, DSNI’s strength clearly emanates from their understanding of the participatory process and tenacious hold on the land.

**WHO STANDS TO LOSE?**

Tenants in the DSNI area stand to lose most in a rushed development because any development would raise the cost of their rents by making the area more attractive in the open market. In DSNI, eighty percent of the residents are renters and most of these are Puerto Rican. The area’s
proximity to downtown and easy access to public transportation make extremely vulnerable to
displacement.

The Puerto Ricans, according to Selznick and others, are not easily organized by virtue of our
class standing and the push-pull immigration dynamic. As organizations are prerequisites for
entering into a cooptative relationship, the lack of such renders Puerto Ricans, and other
similar groups (Dominicans) ineffectual in this dance. Puerto Ricans continue unorganized
because of our heterogeneity: multi-cultural and belonging to many different churches most of
which do not enjoy the Catholic Church’s political power.

Moreover, as development encroaches, whether from DSNI or any other source, individuals
within this group who may depend on the informal sector for subsistence may become victims of
a higher quality of life for others. For example a large portion of the Puerto Ricans in the
DSNI area make their living from fixing cars on the street or in their back yards. One of the
first policies of a higher quality of life in the area has been the eradication of abandoned cars.
These cars are usually on the street to be fixed by street mechanics and then sold. DSNI created
an abandoned car hotline as part of its organizing strategy. The outcome is a better
neighborhood for some, to the detriment of the street mechanics, who probably moved into the
area because they couldn’t conduct business anywhere else.

It is my contention that poor people such as these need areas where they can afford to live
independently. An organizing group should incorporate the needs of the larger community
before embarking on a home ownership ideal alone. This can be a basis for conflict over control
of the institutions within the neighborhood. To avert conflicts between homeowners and
tenants, DSNI may investigate the viability of creating an eviction free zone within its
boundaries. The perception to tenants would be that their concerns are on an equal footing as
homeowners’ and in the long run, more cooperation may evolve. On the one hand, you have
DSNI’s ideology of a better quality of life, which may be home ownership-driven, through its
partnership with PFD, and on the other, you have a community of people who have nowhere else to live. Even DSNI’s community development would displace them or their livelihood.

When an organization enters into a relationship with the City of Boston, it must play by the rules of the game. An old Boston saying: “The only game in town is politics.” In DSNI’s case it has joined the Mayor’s re-election timeline. Through the partnership with PFD, the new goal, electing the Mayor, its benefactor, may have moved DSNI away from its original goal of creating social change through community organizing and empowerment. Driven by a constituency group (homeowners and businessmen) that stands to benefit the most from development, may deter it from its self deterministic ideology, pressuring it to enter into a dependent and subjugated relationship in the name of community development.

While getting these perspectives on the dance, I’ve had no access to Mayor Flynn. His perspective would have presented a counterbalance to the following finding: The evidence upholding the need to use DSNI as a damper on the Mandela incorporation project is not overwhelming. However, the data suggest it as a plausible mitigating condition, and a primary factor in the Mayor’s support of the DSNI/City partnership. According to the Roxbury Neighborhood Council’s Chuck Turner:

The context for the involvement of the RNC with the City and to what extent this was a method of controlling the community is evident when put in a greater context. For example: The Roxbury community was pressing for decision making power in its community development through the existing institutions - the Mayor and the BRA. On the other hand, you had Project Fate, which was actively organizing the Roxbury community for the incorporation of Mandela, a separate municipality with the general boundaries of Roxbury within it. Furthermore, this was election time. The Mayor decided to create a PFD/DSNI partnership. He touted this as an innovative decision on his part, giving eminent domain authority to a community group. The Mayor could then use DSNI as an example of his commitment to Roxbury’s land control movement, thereby defusing the Mandela incorporation initiative. The Mayor went so far as to use Roxbury’s own leadership to defuse the Mandela movement. The Reverend Charles Stith, renowned spokesman for Boston’s Black community, came out in favor of the Mayor’s plan and opposed the Mandela movement.

In all actuality, DSNI is a very small concession to the Roxbury residents. The land control movement is a much larger movement in Roxbury. But DSNI can be
pointed to by the Mayor through the media to foster his populist political ambitions and to quench the demands for actual self-determination.


Avault, John (BRA) (revised 1985). Expanding Home Opportunities in Roxbury


APPENDIX I

PERSPECTIVES ON THE DANCE: THE INTERVIEWS

MRS. MILDRED DANIELS AND HER HUSBAND, MR. DANIELS
LONGTIME RESIDENTS OF ROXBURY AND DSNI MEMBERS

This was an impromptu interview and it only became an interview after the fact because I asked them if I could use the shared moment in my thesis. They know so much about the history of Boston, and they were so involved in the community. I'm going to have to tell this like a short story, and if it doesn't work then I'll just have to rewrite it.

I was headed to DSNI for an interview with Andrea Nagel. I was about two and a half hours early at Dudley Station, so I decided to walk and enjoy Roxbury. I walked up Dudley Street from the bus terminal up a little hill on Mount Pleasant Street, an empty lot. I looked back toward Dudley Station. And I'm really testing the area because I've been out of it; I've been out of my environment and I'm testing it for change, physical change as well as human change. I look toward Dudley terminal and I see a passage for my thesis right before my eyes-- the OIC building. I see these municipal buildings at Dudley Station, all boarded up. It's unbelievable. It's like seeing something you're studying in books and there it is right in front of your face. And of course, being optimistic about community development, the four structurally sound and architecturally correct boarded-up buildings seem stately to me, government style, old municipal style buildings right in the center of Downtown Roxbury. And there's nothing, no energy, just burnt out boarded up buildings; it resonates with disinvestment. It's about 2:15 and young Latinos and African-Americans are milling about the street. A woman pushes her baby stroller. I turn to walk up Mount Pleasant Street, very much aware of my surroundings. I see the drug deals. But I also see new development, there's some real development going on. There's
Nuestra Comunidad's Mount Pleasant Street Development, Sunnyside Nursery. I know Mount Pleasant Street. This side of Mount Pleasant Street, near Dudley Street, borders Orchard Park Projects. This is Roxbury's drug trade. This is the corner of the heroin. This is where life really can be worthless. The young folks involved in the drug trade notice me noticing them, but I believe that my demeanor, my confidence assures them, and they just acknowledge my presence and I acknowledge them and we're just like ships passing in the night.

Mount Pleasant Street is a real story in itself. It's an excellent story in community development. Where I'm at right now is the devastation, ten more feet and I'm into new development, Nuestra Comunidad CDC is really moving ahead in developing this area. That could be a thesis in itself, how Nuestra Comunidad, also originating from Alianza Hispana, like DSNI, but unlike DSNI, it's a development organization. And development, when successful, is readily visible. Planning on the other hand...

Moving a little further on Mount Pleasant Street, I reach the Carmelite Monastery with its surrounded by double eight-foot walls, red brick. I look through a wrought-iron fence, I see double walls. And a plaque, "The Carmelite Monastery has been registered on the registry of historic places, circa 1863" It's very Catholic. I look up and I see the statue of the Holy Virgin Mary and Jesus Christ, white statues looking down over the wall. But I see no people inside and I wonder, do those walls keep those people from the community, or do they keep the community from those people.

On Mount Pleasant Street, there's a great tot lot. In winter time it has two large iron gates with a hole in them that if you really want to look inside you can. The iron gates have a mural on them. And the mural is of rainbow children playing with a rainbow of musical notes and piano keys. The backdrop is a cityscape, if you really look, you can almost hear the pulsating beat. Looking through the hole in the gates, I see the children's summertime playthings, swings with old-fashioned horses, an old truck that may have delivered ice in the area back before
refrigeration. It's now been painted pink and yellow and purple and the children play in it. It's part of the playground.

As I peer into the lot, I remember my two little boys playing there with Ma Daniels, Mildred Daniels, the sage who opens and runs the tot lot. My two boys love her. But it's not summer yet, it's just barely spring and the tot lot probably won't open for another three weeks. City Year, an inner city youth program, designed around the Vista Peace Corps model, will clean up the lot, refurbish it and paint the murals again for the grand reopening of Ma Daniels' lot, maybe Ray will come. I remember last year, the kickoff for the City Year program, there were balloons and soda for the kids and all the celebrities came -- right on Mount Pleasant Street. Mount Pleasant Street is not Roxbury's main drag, it's this little winding road that crescents from Dudley St. meeting Dudley at the Dudley Triangle.

I continued my walk, carrying my backpack, and notice for the first time in this area, "Apartment for Rent" signs in some of the three-decker houses. The last time I was here there were no apartments anywhere. The real estate market was booming and people were afraid to move because they couldn't afford to live anywhere else. I remember people in the street with the desperate questions they asked a person like myself who walks everywhere he goes, "do you know where there's an apartment? Can you refer me somewhere?" - couples, single mothers, families with children - mostly Latinas, but could be of any ethnic background. Two years ago. They'd ask me then, and I'd assure them that if I did I would call them or they could come see me at my office at DSNI, but I knew that there weren't any. The vacancy rate was just too low. There's a change now. With some of the housing in Roxbury coming on line, with PFD's housing right here on Mount Pleasant Street and Nuestra's housing in this part and other parts of Roxbury, there are now more units; people have more options. The real estate market has slackened a bit and people are not as afraid to venture out of their apartments and seek better places to live. That's why it was striking for me to see an apartment for rent on Mount Pleasant Street.
Now I'm walking toward Alianza. My step quickens. On my left is Vine Street, and on the corner of Vine Street and Dudley Street is an empty lot. Twenty years ago, I worked in a great building on that lot: The Model Cities Program. My job was to canvass this very area here for people's opinions on "development." I didn't even know what development was at that time. I was handed a survey and spoke mostly with black families and occasionally with a Puerto Rican family or individual. But more importantly, right here on Vine Street and Mount Pleasant Street, lives Mildred Daniels. And I haven't seen her since I left Roxbury for MIT.

I open the chain link fence thinking how ingenious a device Mr. Daniels had designed to keep the fence from opening, and closing when you just pushed it. Made out of wood - it's not something you would buy it's something you would have to carve. It's like a functional piece of art. I look up at the historic wooden house; this is after all the historic end of Mount Pleasant Street. I ring the bell and I think that Mrs. Daniels may not be home. Last I heard, she was in Mississippi, visiting her sister. Her daughter, Margarett, is the Assistant Dean of the Graduate School at MIT. She told me that Mrs. Daniels may not be at home, but she was at the door quickly after I rang the bell. Her eyes looked into mine and she knew who I was right away. She looked over my shoulder, past me, down into the world as it were, and then invited me into her home. That impressed me, because she was inviting me into her home, acknowledging my absence from the community with her eyes and also cognizant of all the infinity behind me. We hugged she offered me coffee "come in, sit down" There was no way I could get away now. I was going to get on to my meeting but there was no way I could get away now. Mr. Daniels came into the living room, gray haired African-American man at least in his seventies, upright, jovial and jubilant. Shakes my hand warmly and squeezes it and puts his hand on my shoulder and asks me, "where have you been?" Their granddaughter tries to remember me. Of course, when you're only twelve, two years makes a lot of difference. But the ferocious-looking Doberman Pincer remembers me. If I didn't know him and he didn't know me, he sure would look very different. The house is impeccably clean everything is in order,
antiques. I sit down at the table Mrs. Daniels brings me coffee and Mr. Daniels offers me a Dunkin' Donut. I want the chocolate one, but of course the chocolate one has already been protected by the woman-child. "She's already eaten one," says Mr. Daniels. Mildred presents me a petition to sign; she's very active in the Forest, Vine, Mount Pleasant Street Neighborhood Association. The petition is already full of signatures, not even a line left for me. I read it. It's a petition against Nuestra's proposed development of nine single room occupancy units and housing for people with AIDS and also mentally retarded people. Their concern is that to house these people with special needs in one area is harsh. They also felt that low income single room occupants may turn out to be transients. When they told me that Nuestra had proposed one-room occupancy at a rate of five hundred dollars a month (market rate), I signed the petition.

Mildred also wanted my opinion on Nuestra Comunidad's proposed takeover of the municipal building on Dudley Street which in the past housed the Cape Verdean House. Nuestra's proposal was to have a recreational center refurbished to house community service programs, and administrative offices. I am adamantly opposed following reasons: 1.) The City government has a responsibility to this part of Roxbury for recreational services, safety, public works, and others. 2.) The Mount Pleasant Street area and Roxbury in general pays its share of taxes and should receive municipal services for these taxes. By shifting the responsibility to a CDC for these services, we're letting the City shirk its responsibility. 3.) Nuestra Comunidad's mandate is to create affordable housing and they're doing a very good job right now. I think they should not dilute their staff's energies by going into another arena. 4.) Having another parochial organization in the community is divisive. For example, we have had the Cape Verdean House for Cape Verdeans, Alianza Hispana for Hispanics, the Roxbury Multi-Service Center for Blacks. Creating another organization like Nuestra's proposed municipal building project would further this divisiveness. What we should be doing is tasking the Mayor for our share of tax dollars and at the same time creating a space where all of these
groups can communicate. If we look at South Boston, Mayor Flynn's neighborhood, all municipal buildings have been refurbished by the City of Boston. He should do the same for Roxbury, and not leave it to a CDC. The City has more resources, can sustain it longer, and Nuestra can get on with its housing development.

Both Mildred and Mr. Daniels agreed. They pointed to the polarization of groups within Roxbury, anything that we could do to get them to communicate and work together would be better for the whole community. Mildred also noted that DSNI's primary strategy is community organizing. Victories won through this strategy are likely to benefit those groups already organized or amenable to being organized. On the other hand, less organized or more difficult to organize groups would receive little benefit from DSNI's accomplishments. Mildred points to visible evidence for this: economic development in the area seems to be driven and benefitting well organized homogeneous groups.

**Paul Yelder, Deputy Director, DSNI**

He was adamant in his analysis of the origin of DSNI. He echoed my reactive theory but also stressed that DSNI's original goal was to stop displacement. He also said that the residential neighborhood within DSNI made it more amenable to organizing than the area around the Parcel 18 economic development plan. He added to my metaphor of the dance and he also added some new dancers. His metaphor of the dance was that DSNI is a girl and when she was young and homely, nobody cared about her. She was initially ignored, but just like young girls as they go through adolescence, she blossomed into a women. Now the two brothers, the BRA and the PFD compete for her attention and affection. They all want to take her to the prom and buy her punch. He continued that in this municipal family there is another brother, EDIC (Economic Development Industrial Corporation). In the planning game in Boston, these three children are *always* stepping on each others' toes.
In 1984, BRA Director Stephen Coyle was in heavy competition to be the planning czar of Boston. Mayor Flynn had appointed him director of the agency, taking over from an unaggressive Bob Ryan. Coyle was adamant in his being The planning czar. He went about snatching his other two brothers' (EDIC and PFD) prized planners. He offered monetary rewards, almost like corporate takeovers, luring the most competent, energetic, and proficient from the other agencies to the BRA. Muhammed Salaam, currently designated BRA development planner for Roxbury, exemplifies this prized neighborhood planner. When Coyle took over as BRA chief, Mohammed was working in the Dudley Station area on commercial planning for the NDEA. Mohammed had created a coalition of businessmen and community leaders in the Dudley Station area of Roxbury, and lured by Coyle, he took this organized commercial coalition to the BRA. Soon after, the famous Dudley Plan was leaked to the press. The plan called for $750 million of commercial revitalization in one of Boston's most disenfranchised neighborhoods and fueled speculation and concern of displacement. The Dudley Plan was Coyle's statement, "I'm Boston's development czar." Roxbury galvanized an anti-displacement movement which evolved into the Greater Roxbury Neighborhood Authority (GRNA), whose creators are renown activists Mel King and Chuck Turner. This group sued the City to create its own neighborhood council, the Roxbury Neighborhood Council, a structure to control development. Mayor Flynn had no choice but to accept this group because of course, he was "the neighborhood Mayor."

I must note that during this time, 1984-85, the Massachusetts "miracle" economy was peaking, Boston real estate was at an all time high, and speculators and developers were everywhere. The entrepreneurial spirit was driven by the success of downtown development and the Route 128 computer boom.

The evolution of PFD from NDEA (Neighborhood Development and Economic Agency) is important because the NDEA was Mayor White's (Flynn's predecessor) instrument for
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handling CDBG funds. Under Mayor Flynn’s reorganization, the neighborhood development part became PFD and the economic development part became Jobs and Community Services, which has now become an arm of EDIC. PFD’s primary task was to be the primary neighborhood development agency; its secondary task was to maintain and secure municipal buildings (schools, libraries, firehouses). The importance of PFD’s role in development right after the reorganization was that abandoned municipal buildings were being auctioned off for condominium conversion throughout Boston. So PFD, through these condominium conversions, entered into the rehabilitation planning game in Boston and became a primary dancer in Boston’s community development.

The relationship between PFD and DSNI: Because PFD was the primary neighborhood development agency for the City, it was the primary contact for DSNI, whose comprehensive plan (DAC) called for the development of the public and private empty lots within its geographic boundary. The City, who owned these lots through tax foreclosure, tasked PFD with the responsibility for disposition of the land. Interestingly, DSNI urged PFD to use its eminent domain power to also acquire private lots that had been abandoned into eyesores and blight. PFD, upon closer scrutiny of its mandated eminent domain powers, realized that it could only take this private land to build municipal buildings. This would not really help the community much.

A MYSTERY OF THE ORIGINS OF DSNI’S EMINENT DOMAIN POWERS

There are two stories to the origin of eminent domain, and both are noteworthy in that they are rumors. There is no documentation, which actually points to the oral tradition in the Indigenous Paradigm here. Policy comes out of people’s ideas and is implemented. The trail is lost in sound waves. The first story says that Stephen Coyle, director of the BRA, suggested it to Peter Medoff, then director of DSNI, on an elevator ride in City Hall. The second is told by Paul Yelder: that law firm Rakeman, Sawyer and Brewster instructed DSNI to propose that
the BRA transfer its eminent domain power to the DSNI board. At a subsequent meeting with Stephen Coyle, before the board could propose it, he suggested it to them. Now the question is, whose idea was DSNI’s eminent domain powers. Was it DSNI’s, by way of its legal counsel? Or Stephen Coyle’s as a way of snatching neighborhood planning away from PFD to BRA through DSNI? Because up until this point PFD was still the neighborhood planning organization. Following the Mayor’s populism, Stephen Coyle’s career ambitions necessitated that he become the neighborhood planner and DSNI served that purpose.

Paul’s theory on the relationship between BRA and DSNI is that during the development peak 1984-85, there was intense infighting between the BRA, EDIC, and PFD this internal conflict actually benefitted DSNI because they could play one against the other. All of their boundaries seemed to overlap. EDIC was the industrial development planner. Stephen Coyle and the BRA moved to usurp that power, for example in Charlestown’s Navy Yard development. PFD leadership, on the other hand, felt that the BRA should stay downtown: “Be the downtown planner. Let us be the neighborhood planners.” Coyle’s use of DSNI’s eminent domain was one-upmanship, actually pushing PFD aside. “I’m making this thing work.” But DSNI and PFD continued to dance, even after eminent domain transfer from the BRA. In the application, which transfers the eminent domain powers from the BRA to DSNI, there is a unique marriage; PFD and DSNI comprise a Joint Disposition Committee (Joint Disposition Committee), which makes decisions on the disposition of parcels within DSNI’s Dudley Triangle project. In this uptown-downtown marriage, the BRA was the father that gave the bride (DSNI) away. There are two perspectives on this marriage. One: PFD injected itself into the deal through the Joint Disposition Committee. Or two: The BRA, as the facilitator, used PFD as its delegate. The Joint Disposition Committee is made up of 50/50 representation of PFD and DSNI. Once development begins, the Joint Disposition Committee is phased out and Dudley Neighbors Incorporated (DNI), which is to function as a land trust, and on whose behalf DSNI submitted its application to the BRA, is born.
Paul Yelder continues his contribution to this research with relish and insight. He lived through the gentrification struggle in the South End, a professional African-American, working for one of DSNI's founding members, the Roxbury Multi-Service Center. He continued to share with me his unique insight. When I asked him about community, he said that community to him meant common thought or people with something in common beyond geography, common goals, common heritage. But in his present job, as Deputy Director for DSNI, he had to think that community was geographic in nature. He said that DSNI's initial goal was to create a comprehensive revitalization plan for the neighborhood that prevented displacement through control of the land. Initially, DSNI would use the City mechanism to exert democratic pressure on the approval of developers and development plans in the neighborhood. This ideology evolved to owning the land and to DNI Land Trust, which in the long term would control affordability and the quality of the housing built on Roxbury's land. To me, this clearly shows that DSNI is a mirror to a community's evolution. Because nowhere in the DAC plan is a proposal for land trust or eminent domain. The DAC plan is just a blueprint on how to select developers through a City process and DSNI would oversee the development. It doesn't specify how, whether through CDCs or some other mechanism. They didn't specify; they left it up to the community to decide its future course.

**Funding Sources**

According to Paul, the beauty of DSNI's funding, exemplified in the Mabel Louise Riley Fund, is that there are no major restrictions on the money. Unlike other charitable funds, this money can be used for mundane tasks, like organizing. There are not restrictions on the use of the money. The Riley Foundation bought into DSNI's structure. We can compare this with other funding sources, such as United Way, where corporate membership is encouraged and the funds are project-specific. This is anathema to indigenous planning, because the corporate members on the neighborhood boards create a detached, controlled development that may not serve the
community's true needs. It is very important for DSNI's participatory, democratic ideology that it has found such a patron.

**THE ROLE OF BANKS**

Currently, because the banks are going through a lot of economic fallout because of the S&L bailout and other regional slowdowns, their involvement in DSNI is minimal. But in the future, assuming that the economy shifts, DSNI will be able to put pressure on the banks to invest in its development projects through the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA). As one of the neighborhoods that the Federal Reserve Bank study on "redlining" shows as habitually disenfranchised, Roxbury, through DSNI can benefit from the settlement. It is important in this finance that the banks look at DSNI's development plans as comprehensive and not look at each project as a separate project. Their involvement with DSNI is critical for economic development especially for working capital and start-up monies. Paul welcomes the banks' involvement in DSNI's comprehensive plan, and I must stress, comprehensive plan.

I wanted to get back to the dance. I'm just really interested in this dance. The band is playing. There are new dancers coming in the door. I'm amazed at the reasons for coming to the dance and I wanted to know, in particular, the reason for his coming to the dance. The one over there, the one in the center, the one all the lights are shining on, the one that keeps talking about comprehensive health care, the person that looks like he could be anybody's brother, could have played on anybody's basketball team, the one that endorses Cesar Chavez' anti-pesticide campaign and urges the City Council, no less, to ban grapes from City Hall - Ray! The jogger. What's his role in all this? Who did he bring to the dance? I know that he could be up there conducting the band. He chooses not to do that? Why? Paul says that he could be clearer in his directive to PFD, letting DNI become the developer of the triangle project, thereby curtailing all the paperwork and bureaucratic process in some of PFD's programs. I must mention here the 747 program, which is named after the 747 empty lots owned by the City, which Ray (Mayor
Flynn) has tasked this City department to develop for affordable housing. Well, because DSNI has most of those empty lots, it must play by PFD’s rules. Ray’s directive would really let DSNI dance to its own tune, on its own time, and not follow the constricted PFD timeline.

Initially, Mayor Flynn was instrumental in DSNI’s successes. For instance, when the community residents petitioned his office to close down the trash transfer stations, he responded. As a matter of fact, he was the one who closed the padlock - of course, getting great publicity! When DSNI petitioned the BRA for eminent domain, it was Mayor Flynn who pressured the Board of Directors, who were opposed to this upstart community group creating its own plans. It was Mayor Flynn who championed DSNI’s success. But for me, yours truly, the researcher here, the person who lives around the corner on West Cottage Street, he could do more. (The residents in the Dudley Triangle, residents of Roxbury, are hard pressed to walk through his community, South Boston, even to go to the beach. Our children will probably be mauled. He could do more.

I’d like to know what he thinks about this. I’d really like to know if he’d tell me, “José, we’ve got to go slow. You can’t ram integration down people’s throats. You’ve got to take the time.” But I’ve got to say to Ray, “Look Ray, you have an opportunity here. For the first time in the history of Boston, people of all colors from all areas are willing to stop and talk about it. You’re the leader. But you’re not in step. You’re not conducting. You’re leaving it up to others to choose the songs to be played at the dance. We’re all looking to you. We don’t need another basketball game when our kids are shooting each other over drugs. Is this due to lack of recreational and educational programs? It’s up to the mayor of Boston to task the Stephen Coyles, the Lisa Chapnicks, the Dwyers, the Francis Roaches to play the songs the dancers want to dance to, not just their songs.)

I asked Paul to give me a vision of the worst case scenario for DSNI. He said, “well, you know, I see that DSNI builds and no one moves in. The land trust developments go ‘belly-up.’ Like, the OIC (Opportunities Industrial Corporation) development down the street on Dudley. They just can’t sell them; they’re empty. And for this to happen to DSNI would mean that we would
not be able to implement the rest of the plan.” Because after all, you can see buildings, you can’t see human development. “Not building anything is not bad.” Because you can still work on non-physical development. “But building something that’s not successful may stall everything else that we would want to do.” And this leads me to ask him about:

**Human Services Development**

How do you measure success? To me, this is very important, because this is development that’s not market-driven. This is where DSNI’s strategy diverges from the BRA’s strategy. Human services do not expand the tax base. Human services development is hard to measure and evaluate. But Paul says that

To measure success, one must look at strategies and goals. From Andrea Nagel’s (DSNI Human Services Director) neighborhood profile, and looking into the future five years, look to see what we have accomplished. Have we satisfied any of these needs? This is how to measure success. Eventually, human development organizations should go out of business. This is successful. As opposed to providing a service, success of a human development organization is working yourself out of a job. But to do this, you must institutionalize long-term programs.

I’m really curious here. It really strikes a good chord with me because of my experience as a social worker and community organizer. I have to ask Paul - almost knowing the answer - what does a physical development agency do when there’s no development to be done, or, better stated, in a down market. He said,

For me, as deputy director of DSNI, I work to institute the land trust, DNI, which in a down market, maintains and enhances the quality of life. And in an ongoing program of housing development, maintains the physical development and expands and maintains open spaces. I guess it’s important in a down market to maintain. Our land trust will eventually be a housing management tool.
There definitely is a relationship between the BRA and DSNI and DSNI is actually a reaction to the BRA’s Dudley Square Plan, which was leaked to the Herald by [probably] somebody in the City council. That’s the origin of the relationship. It’s a reactive strategy to the BRA’s development plan for Dudley Square, which is in the heart of Roxbury. Supposedly the City was going to pump in 750 million dollars into the heart of the City’s poorest neighborhood. Chuck Turner, during this time had organized the Roxbury Neighborhood Council to control the development in Roxbury by having all development in Roxbury reviewed by this group. During the same time, Ray Flynn, Mayor of Boston, was also creating appointed neighborhood councils in every neighborhood throughout the City, including Roxbury. Turner’s group demanded that it be that group in Roxbury.

What interested Kelly was that Roxbury’s residents chose to concentrate an organizing effort within the Dudley Triangle and the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, and not Parcel 18, which is a more centrally located parcel and more economically feasible. He feels that the control of this interaction right now is in the hands of DSNI because of its organized constituency and its private funding sources, like the Riley and Ford Foundations. He also sees these foundations as eventually getting out because of the length of time between planning and implementation. I asked him what role the banks played. He said that the banks right now are in policy, trying to work out a community reinvestment strategy, which Gus Newport, DSNI’s executive director has taken a part in, to alleviate the "redlining" in Roxbury. Because of the down real estate market and the condition of the State economy this effort is currently on hold. He also stated that a project like DSNI would really be attractive to banks because of the creative financing schemes with MHFA and other subsidies which would almost guarantee financial stability.
I asked him about the Mayor’s role and I told him about Marie Kennedy’s analysis of a critical mass of antagonistic voters in Roxbury and the inevitable failure of DSNI. He said that, on the contrary, that the Mayor wanted DSNI to be a success because it would prove to the City population that he was a neighborhood Mayor, a populist - which would further his political ambitions. DSNI’s success would prove his politics of “inclusion” and would be the crowning achievement of his integrative politics.

He talked at length about displacement because of the downside of the neighborhood - the reasons people move away, which is an interesting concept and the first I’ve heard of it. He explained it using an example: Within the DSNI area there are illegal and legal trash transfer stations, in effect dumps. The air smells foul. There are dirty trucks up and down the streets. Garbage sits on empty land. Individuals and families searching for a better life leave the area. In short, the much chronicled “brain drain” of Roxbury’s human resources. He made a point to distinguish between organizing against displacement and organizing for controlled development. He saw both of these as DSNI’s original goals. For me, the issue here is an issue of control. In the first instance, you are organizing as a reaction to development. In the second instance, you are organizing proactively to control development. This is an area to explore further in future interviews.

When asked about his future projections for Roxbury, Kelly initially hedged, but I prodded him to put on his DUSP MCP visionary cap. He peered into the future and gave me two possible scenarios, one optimistic and one pessimistic. He started off, “in the best of cases:” DSNI’s physical development will be completed within five years and then the people can get down to real issues like education, jobs, training, and human development issues. He even ventured to infuse the term “spiritual development” into his overall vision. Alas, as a good economist, he also had to project the downside or his pessimistic view: A minimal amount of building would take place. The funding sources would dry up. The community will disperse. One building, or
two, will be pointed to as the monument to that Great Plan. "Remember that Plan, that Great Plan that those visionaries had, but couldn't quite implement."

He also gave me some insight into BRA executive director Coyle's thinking around the original Dudley Plan. Coyle was always talking about those people in Roxbury as "interested in process." He was interested more in outcome and "this was the time to create and we mustn't lose the opportunity." So in effect Coyle's approach was that the institution knows what's best because of its technocratic skills and its political mandate to serve "the public good." I presented Kelly the concept of indigenous planning and that the original organizing within DSNI was one of the precepts. If this were to be replicated in East Palo Alto or Denver, Colorado, then to me, it would not be indigenous planning. He said something really interesting. He said it's to be replicated in Kenmore Square, Kenmore Square CDC. He also said that some aspects of the plan would be replicated. He gave an example that in Kenmore Square there weren't any empty lots and most likely the group would not choose the eminent domain route, but would choose another route. And the DSNI strategy was not really new. It goes back to the 1960s, to EOCD, which used concepts such as "empowerment," "participation," and "process" in its community development strategies. He really stressed that this isn't really new and some things can be replicated while others will be indigenous.

**ANDREA NAGEL, DIRECTOR OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, DSNI**

Andrea Nagel was the original community organizer for DSNI in 1984. She took two years to study planning at MIT and then returned in 1990 to continue her work. I started the interview with the same question that I asked all my interviewees. I asked her to define "community." I asked for an individual definition and then to define it in the context of her work at DSNI. She indicated that community to her, personally, was much more of a feeling of kinship. It could be along political lines:
I consider myself pretty far to the left. I feel in common with new immigrants and people from other countries and women, like myself. But at different times, this includes different people with different interests, people I work with, friends. In my role at DSNI, I think that the organization and the members of the organization see community as their immediate neighborhood, ethnic community, sub-neighborhood, their block, the geographic Dudley area which is a code word for DSNI. And some even encompass my personal definition.

Here, we both exchanged philosophical points around community organizing but we both converged on “flexibility.” Community is flexible. Community sometimes encompasses somebody else who brings in their definition of community. It’s like an amoeba, always changing and taking in something new.

I wanted to get her perspective on DSNI and the City dance. I reiterated other interviewees’ analyses of DSNI being a reaction to the Dudley Plan. At that time, people were petrified of the South End’s displacement and saw the Dudley Plan as a harbinger of gentrification. I presented to her the forces that to me were coincidental in creating DSNI, the booming real estate economy, the Massachusetts Miracle, Coyle’s ambitions, Raymond Flynn’s political ambitions, but she said that it was an interrelationship of these forces and it was not coincidental. She went on to explain the initial organizing of DSNI as driven by agency heads that proposed a governance structure for the community planning of the Dudley area. At the first community meeting, residents rejected the proposed governance as a reaction to the closed door policy. This was a dramatic turning point. The reality was that this opened the participatory process. If it was to succeed, it needed to include coalition members. If it wasn’t open, it could never be implemented.

We talked about organizing and community empowerment organizations such as DSNI. I wanted to know what she meant by empowerment. She said that “empowerment, to a black person, is black people at all levels of society, including positions of power.” I pressed her to touch on some controversial issues that community organizers are dear to. For instance, the BRA’s and most community development organizations’ measures of a community’s strengths
uses home ownership as one of its indicators. “Home ownership is seventy percent in X area...this must be good...” So in an area that has a high percentage of its residents as tenants, this may pit homeowners against tenants for control of the planning organizations. This is where we really became a bit adversarial. I gave her an example of the organization being perceived as home-ownership driven, where the community-organizing was initially conducted to close down trash-transfer stations for all the reasons that you should close down legal or illegal trash-transfer stations. But in a market-driven economy, the closing down of these operations benefit the homeowners in the area monetarily while making the area more attractive to higher priced renters that may then displace the people that live there because they couldn’t afford to live anywhere else. Her retort was brilliant. Measuring benefit on a monetary scale alone won’t do. “Just to take your example,” she said, “one step further. Picture the family in the Orchard Park Projects that keeps its windows closed in the scorching heat of the summer or be nauseated by the stench of the garbage in these dumps. When we organized them and the homeowners and everybody else around the areas to close these operations, they can then open their windows and enjoy some fresh air. They benefit also.”

I talked to Andrea about Mildred’s concerns of ethnic polarization in the DSNI area. She said, “there’s nothing wrong with places where people can communicate with their own kind, with people from their own culture, and celebrate their own cultural values. The problem arises when agency leaders do not celebrate diversity. They could work to build communication among and between these different groups. They themselves choose a divisive role. But they are pitted against each other by funding sources, competing against each other for scarce resources. They could work in a more collaborative way. It’s great that their agencies are staffed with people that can provide services to those in need in their own cultural context. They could work closer with each other. For example, the Roxbury Multi-Service Center could outreach the Cape Verdean House and Alianza when it celebrates its African-American heritage. Alianza could do the same by encouraging Latino power in a larger sense that encourages a larger
participation, coalition-building.” I asked her what she was doing to alleviate the problem as a human development director. She didn’t hesitate. She has initiated an agency collaborative to be pro-active with common strategies for cooperation. Some participants are: Alianza Hispana, Roxbury Multi-Service Center, the Roxbury YMCA, the Bird Street Community Center, Project Hope, and others.

Evaluating success: When a community development organization builds, its success is apparent. It is common knowledge that to get something built is a pretty intricate process with a lot of pitfalls. But how do you evaluate human development? Andrea peered into the ceiling and then focussed her gaze on me and answered that she would evaluate her success as seeing a human development master plan incorporated into DSNI’s comprehensive community development plan. She would measure success if she saw a strong leadership in the community that would work around the issues that the human development committee had identified and prioritized: childcare and youth. Moreover, she saw as a measure of success residents determining for themselves how to tackle these issues and moving forward to reach their goals. For example, parents on the education subcommittee would organize around how to influence their children's education. In this model, the parents would prioritize their issues, a self-determining model as opposed to being driven by outside “leaders” like the school committee members that tell the parents how they should involve themselves in their children’s education. “The human development committee workplan is used as benchmark for progress as we move along, setting out our plan of action and using it as a guideline.”

Andrea is a community organizer at heart. I’m a community organizer. So when we get together we confront issues that to other people would be too difficult to even speak of. We talked about racial tensions, ethnic differences, we knew we needed to explore this. It needs further exploration, but this is a first stab at it. Cape Verdeans are the new immigrant group and as such they have been targets of racism from Whites, Blacks, and Latinos. These stem from cultural differences among the residents. As I ride MBTA bus #15, Kane Square, Ruggles Street
via Dudley Station, I'm aware of our conversation around this issue. But it's more complex than it seems at first. Elderly people are usually closer to their cultural traditions than young people - this is by virtue of tradition. They have picked up their cultural values and lived them, whereas the young people have not picked up the values and have not had the experience to live them. When Cape Verdean women in their African prints balancing formidable loads on their turbaned heads meander onto a bus, they may be jeered by young African-Americans who may not know that this is a direct link to their primary culture. Whereas a person like me, Puerto Rican and acknowledging the African blood that flows through my veins, sees this as a celebration of my ancestry and a sacred living icon on an inner-City landscape like a primary color on a bland palette - a primary culture in a sanitized image.

Andrea's optimistic vision is that Phase I and Phase II of the Triangle Plan are completed and Phase III is getting underway. One of the two community centers is being built. The funding is in place and construction is beginning. The community reclaims its central recreational space, Mary Hanon Park. DSNI is continually organizing residents around the communal vision and we have a strongly organized Black, Cape Verdean, Latino community with a strong economy. But she thinks that this will happen when people hit rock bottom and organize as a result of not wanting to take it any longer, saying "no" to disinvestment.

Her pessimistic view is that there is no change in the economic situation, even though Boston's overall economy turns around. That we are not on target with our housing development and the community centers are not moving forward. She says that this is a possibility, given Governor Weld's current budget cuts. Poverty will increase dramatically. Drug use and crime will be pervasive. And the neighborhood, home to the most disenfranchised, becomes all the more alienated.
Gus Newport, Executive Director, DSNI

To be consistent with the other interviewees', I asked Gus about DSNI's goals. He said that DSNI's goals as he sees them are to totally redevelop the Dudley area, to build housing stock which is affordable to people that live there - for those with limited income, and to build infrastructure to address the community's needs - such as health care, education, etc. But he said that the primary goal is the continual process of organizing the people. For the people themselves, to use DSNI as a technical tool, to educate themselves about the political system and institutions and to help them see the correlation of poverty to these institutions, to stabilize their lives - the lives of the people who live here. In other words, for DSNI's organizing to be a stabilizing force in the community.

I asked him about the dance, the City's interaction with DSNI through the BRA, PFD, and other planning organizations. He said that after DSNI and the BRA signed the eminent domain regulatory agreement, their dance basically ended there. Although in the zoning process for Roxbury and all of Boston, the BRA is still involved. But in the actual development of the DSNI community, the present dance is between the PFD, whose basic mission with DSNI is through the Buildable Lots Program (747). PFD understands the criteria upon which DSNI will build. The relationship has gotten better since DSNI has become institutionalized politically. In the initial relationship, PFD was driving the development timetable because of the Mayor's need to build something on the 747 identified empty lots as quickly as possible. But DSNI was adamant about not building anything until the right mix of subsidy and market-rate financing was available, otherwise they would become agents of gentrification. This has been the difficulty in the partnership. The need to build on PFD's part and the need to build correctly on DSNI's part and the two timetables have not coincided.
Right now, the partnership between PFD and DSNI is a bit strained because of the economy. The subsidies to build on DSNI’s terms are just not there. Gus says that there is a divorce on with PFD because of communication problems and trust problems. The PFD bureaucracy makes it difficult to communicate and DSNI gets different answers from different people on the same questions. Gus also perceives a low level of respect from PFD as an institution toward the people in DSNI. He retrogressed to the time when DSNI originated: “Poor people got tired of the bullshit and took conditions into their own hands. They are more patient to develop the right community, whereas PFD is willing to build anything for political gain.”

Gus’ political perspective: When I asked Gus about DSNI’s political relationship with the power structure in Boston, and the control that may be exerted through City agencies. He said that this is a usual theoretical radical analysis that is put forth by theoreticians and not practitioners. As a practitioner he has to be aware of the fact that partnerships have constraints on both sides and that the City of Boston could not give DSNI the power to develop all this City acreage without some controls. Radical analysis would say that these controls would spell failure for the development. A practitioner would say that these are practical controls to ensure public good. Although he does agree with some of the radical perspective, he says that it’s not as black and white as a theoretician may propose. He said also that the community has not accepted carte blanche the regulatory agreement that calls for a certain timeline within which to develop, but has continually petitioned and is now in the process of appealing this timeline, so that development matches the community’s vision.

For example, during the South End’s confrontation of the BRA’s displacement plan (urban renewal) the people organized and they wanted to be included in the urban renewal plan itself. Some may call this a success, but when we look back, this approach was only able to wrest one small piece of that valuable real estate for community benefit. DSNI is trying to build on the successes and failures of the South End’s organizing efforts, in other words, not just to be included
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in the plan, but how to control the planning process, so that they can build the community for themselves. And the outcome is inevitable, whether DSNI builds the complete community according to the community’s plan, or somebody else builds the community according to the DAC plan, which has been institutionalized in the City’s zoning code for Roxbury. This is a huge victory, because the DAC plan that DSNI commissioned will come to fruition eventually. It’s just a matter of time and a matter of who implements it. Right now, the implementation is in the hands of DSNI and PFD. That’s the present political process, but it doesn’t necessarily have to be the only process by which the community’s plan, the community’s vision becomes a reality.

The Mayor’s Role: When DSNI filed its application to the BRA for eminent domain, the BRA staff, including Director Stephen Coyle, were enthusiastic. But the BRA Commissioners were generally opposed. It took pressure from Mayor Flynn to get these people to abandon their opposition. Gus said that this was because Mayor Ray Flynn comes from a working class background in South Boston. Although Gus won’t go so far as to say that Flynn doesn’t have any racist tendencies, or that his administration doesn’t need work on its racism, his working-class upbringing aligns him with the people in Roxbury. But Flynn needs to send a message to his people (PFD) to slow down the development timeline, and also to put more resources behind DSNI. The Mayor is exerting a lot of control over development in Roxbury. Gus said that this is because Roxbury has no real representation in the political process. Outside of Nelson Merced, there are no other elected officials who are sensitive to the area’s needs. This makes Roxbury politically divided, with no overall political strategy or goals. He gave an example: “I talked to Flynn and he said that South Boston’s Councillor Kelly is in his office three or four times a day asking for services for his community. He said that since he has been Mayor, Roxbury and Dorchester’s two City Councilors have only requested one thing from him [only one request total], and that was to help a relative.” He said that these politicians need to take a lesson from DSNI’s Board of Directors on representation and commitment for their constituency.
He especially praised Sister Sue Beaton of Project Hope, who is currently developing homes for homeless women with families in the Dudley Street area.

**Funding Sources:** The Riley Foundation, which started DSNI with its $60,000 seed money, is still the primary source of funding. The Ford Foundation is still committed to a $1 million loan to acquire the private land which will be taken through eminent domain. (Through eminent domain, the court imposes a fair market value on each piece of private land slated for taking. This price will have to be paid by DSNI to the rightful owner.) The interest on the loan will be one percent, which DSNI could then put in a long-term certificate of deposit and receive 9-10% interest on, which they then can use. The principal will not be due until five years after the loan is made. Gus says that DSNI will only have to pay the interest per year. He proposes to pay the complete principle in ten years. The source of repayment will come from the sale of the units developed.

PFD has contributed $229 thousand between 1989 and 1990 in grants, most recently a 1991 grant for $84 thousand from the Management Assistance Program for staff support. The constraints on this money are that it be used for development activities, land acquisition, and marketing for Dudley Neighbors, Incorporated (DNI), which will be the land trust. Concomitantly, this grant supports the development director's salary and DNI's director's salary.

**Gus' Vision:** He says right now DSNI is hurting. He spends most of his time writing proposals and fundraising. I asked him to share with me those skills. He said, "what's most important when fundraising is to write a letter of introduction and look through the funder's eyes. Interpret your program through their eyes." He goes on, "my vision starts with Che [DSNI President]'s answer to this very same question when I posed it to her. She said,"

In 1984, there were abandoned cars everywhere, trash and garbage on the land, trash transfer stations and the foul scent in the air. At the intersection of Dudley and Blue Hill Avenue, there were tremendous numbers of accidents because of inappropriate traffic lighting. Since we've organized, Cardinal Medeiro's Housing has been built. The lots are clean. And the dangerous intersection now has brand new traffic lights. MBTA bus stops are now at
appropriate intervals, all marked with signs. None of this may have happened if we had not organized. So, even though you don't see any physical buildings, you can see signs of a higher quality of life.

What's very important is that the DAC plan has been institutionalized into the City's zoning. Whether DSNI builds it or not, the community will be developed according to the community's comprehensive plan. “With a lot of hard work and sweat and with a healthy dose of discipline, plus prayers, we can get this built.”

PAT McGUIGAN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PFD

I was really interested in Pat's perspective on the development timeline causing stress between DSNI and PFD, as expressed by Gus Newport. Pat stated that PFD's timeline emanates from the Mayor's public commitment to develop the 747 empty lots owned by the City by 1990. He promised it when running for re-election. PFD has been tasked to accomplish the Mayor's 747 agenda. When PFD became a partner of DSNI, PFD demanded that the partnership stick to the 747 timeline. “I know that DSNI wants to renegotiate, but a deal is a deal! We have compromised by designating developers and then phasing building so as not to cause speculation and displacement.”

PFD approached the Roxbury Neighborhood Council's Chuck Turner to expedite the approval of the partnership's development proposals. PFD proposed that it would bring development projects to the RNC, which would address the community's concerns and because this was a community-City partnership, the RNC was expected to expedite the participatory approval process. He was adamant in upholding the performance expectations within the eminent domain regulatory agreement. a) There were explicit time horizons for development. And that was because b) the City would be foolish to designate eminent domain authority to DSNI and not have it be used. I reiterated DSNI's need to control the development phase so as not to cause uncontrollable secondary effects, such as Paul Yelder had pointed out to me. Pat stated that
"talk is cheap. This partnership must deliver. The bottom line is 'build some housing.' Don’t they want to see shovels?"

He agreed with about the strained relationship between DSNI and PFD, but he was sure to present to me that both organizations are 50/50 partners here. Each group can stop the other. Each group has rights.

Individual PFD staff, according to Pat, felt that DSNI should already have built by 1990. PFD’s perspective on development is due to its organization as a production agency. The staff is trained to create housing. It is not a planning agency or a redevelopment agency; the last five years have testified to PFD’s tremendous volume of focused production. True, the DSNI/PFD marriage is strained, mostly due to PFD’s role as a production agency, with its timeline. If DSNI was married to the BRA, a planning agency, then the timeline would be different. “But now,” Pat continues, “the real estate market has forced PFD to slow down. A 1991 construction date for first phase development of the Dudley Triangle is good and that’s why PFD is pushing Sister Sue’s development on Magnolia Street, which is in the DSNI core area, but not within the Triangle Project area.”

In 1989, the Joint Disposition Committee designated the developers for Phase One in the Triangle Project. Pat strongly points out to me that “nothing has been built.” It is important for the reader to note that Pat stresses that the Mayor, who personally pushed for DSNI’s eminent domain power, has a four year timeline: “Short term success...The Mayor showed a personal commitment to DSNI and DSNI should take advantage of the Mayor’s commitment because someone else, if elected, can walk away from the contract.” He underlined this by stressing that it was the Mayor that pressured the BRA Commission to accept DSNI’s application for eminent domain. And that the fallout has been the replacing of opposing Commissioners with more politically correct individuals. “If in 1993, we haven’t built anything, we have failed.
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All the talk and talk and planning. We have failed because PFD, by legal structure and mandate, is an implementation agency.” He agreed with DSNI on what should be built in Dudley, but he disagreed on not going forward unless there is a complete plan. “This can be dangerous.”

Disagreement is dangerous, because of the underlying agreement as a partnership. He indicated that DSNI and the PFD had worked hard in the past and continue to work hard in fostering this partnership. To foster a better working relationship, the staff of both organizations have gone on retreats together. The relationship is very difficult, he said, but he felt that it’s healthy to scream at each other,

just like in a marriage. Both groups have really tried. But this is really a new phenomenon - sharing of power, information, and decision-making is new. And there is the issue of trust. DSNI, which has been in a predominantly disenfranchised neighborhood and PFD, which is mostly staffed by whites. In addition, the separatist movement of incorporating Roxbury into its own City, Mandela, all this would seem to get in the way. But the partnership continues because of commitment.

This is really evident, according to Pat, in PFD staff who are young and want to make real changes, who want to be working on something that really matters. “I hear them in their conversations, they have a real pride and excitement about this relationship. It’s historic. It has never been done, and all eyes are upon us.”

Pat presented his personal bias, it’s an interesting concept and its probably the first time I’ve heard it put this way: DSNI, to avoid speculation, wanted to use its eminent domain power and take all the land at once. But the major problem he saw was disinvestment, not speculation. He saw that building something and putting in some public-private investment would fuel more private investment. He saw personal investment (as in home ownership) good for the community in the long run. Amassing all the privately owned land would just curtail this beneficial personal investment. “Ideologically, we don’t have to be the next South End. But we shouldn’t be the next South Bronx. The community is demanding more people, more housing, and
this means new people.” When I asked him what he saw as the community, he said it was wrong to keep people out of the Roxbury area. We should encourage the middle-class to move into Roxbury. “The people in the area need jobs and the young people need role models, they need to provide for themselves. You can’t have a community of poor single women, for example, old Columbia Point. That’s why we needed a mixed income project.”

On the issue of affordability, which I presented to Pat as a divergence between PFD and DSNI, he said that except for homeless projects, all the projects that PFD completes are mixed income. (PFD’s guidelines for the Dudley development are 50% low income.) “This creates a more viable community. Upper income communities are not real. But also, low income communities need resources. There is a value to people being able to do a little better, for Black youth, there are not enough positive role models. They need to see that lawyers, doctors, accountants are also part of their community.” DSNI’s affordability guidelines are higher than PFD’s. But Pat quickly retorted that “resources are not infinite. The more low-income units that are built in a project, the more subsidies that are needed. And DSNI is responsible to bring in the subsidies to make the housing more affordable. They’re also responsible to see where the resources are coming from and who is going to receive them.”

Pat first got involved in community development. He said that twenty years ago as a tenant organizer against infamous slumlord Maurice Gordon. It was then that he met Ray Flynn. It was during this time that he learned some important lessons in organizing:

Who are the people really? Sometimes the people don’t see the organizer as the leader. But good organizers include the broadest common agenda. Mayors are like good organizers. They get paid in votes. There’s really something in coming together.
BRUCE BOLLING, BOSTON CITY COUNCILOR, ROXBURY DISTRICT

Bruce Bolling suggested that the metaphor for the partnership between the City and DSNI, is marriage, especially when looking at the relationship with PFD. As a marriage, it should be a partnership predicated on equality. But this marriage is a troubled one. In order for this to be a successful partnership, the legitimate needs and concerns of DSNI should be acknowledged and respected by the other partner, PFD. But as in troubled marriages, a power relationship evolves with dominance and subjugation. “That’s not what I want to see.” In this relationship, power, control, and authority are central for going forward. But this dance has been problematic from its inception. “You can’t create a structure where those concerned and most impacted in the development area are invited to play an integral role in planning and decision-making and then, when those solicited start doing the things that would empower them for the betterment of their lives, then you say ‘you’re taking too much control’ and then take the power back to city hall.” So the question here is, in the power-control dynamic, who controls the planning and the decision-making? which ultimately translates to simple resource allocation. The determination of the allocation of the resources, if they are subsumed by the City, causes conflict, disservice, and mistrust.

When I presented to him Gus’ analysis of the marriage as now in divorce because of lack of communication, he was sure to point out that it wasn’t lack of communication but lack of effective communication that causes mistrust. Because, when you have a lack of effective communication between partners, as is apparent in the PFD/DSNI marriage, you have a battle of wills. For example, “Gus Newport, Executive Director of DSNI, was hired by the community, to ensure that the development process would have integrity. The residents in the triangle, through this enlightened development process, make informed, educated decisions affecting
their community. That process needs to be respected. Circumventing and invalidating that process, can only bring failure.”

He outlined to me his analysis of the dance, with short anecdotes that highlighted three main issues: paternalistic control, class issues and racial overtones. (paraphrased): The Dudley area is a largely working-class, poor, middle-income community. Folk with relatively little economic means. Here there is a Black, Latino, and to some extent, White political base with few options and some commonality. “They have been through the thinnest of the thins.” They now have an opportunity to resurrect their neighborhood through developing their vast resource of empty land. They see this development to benefit existing residents, but also attracting new residents. The planning process implies that a successful partnership would require support and validating the correctness of the process. You can’t have a public front of empowerment and still have policies of exclusion. He made me analyze this last point, urging me to envision Roxbury, but to look at the conflicting public image of inclusion and the reality of the policy. The first thing I could think about was the municipal buildings within the Dudley area, compared with those in other areas of the City. They are mostly burnt-out abandoned shells - structurally sound with the carved imprint: Municipal Building, City of Boston on their mastheads. The haunting question is, in a community such as Dudley, with higher than average number of children, why aren’t buildings such as these refurbished and funded to provide childcare, youth development programs? This is the conflict between the public image and the public policy. The ideology of the partnership is, “to build a new town with the old town people, and use part of the old town significantly.” We need to build communities where the residents’ diversity is reflected.

I questioned him on PFD’s affordability standards as they are different from DSNI’s, and what he thought this meant in the relationship; was this a matter of stalemate? He said that although we need to bring in a mixed income group, because of the resource dynamic, we must understand that eighty percent of Roxbury’s residents are renters. We have to find some
creative ways of including those people [in a development process] that may never be able to own a home - in cooperatives and other forms of economic stability.

When I asked him about the home-ownership-driven development ideology prevalent in planning for Roxbury, he said that it's alright to have home-ownership drive your planning process, because home-ownership, or when you own where you live - is a positive thing. But we have to expand the capacity for indigenous residents to own their home. Right now, everybody can't be owners. The partnership needs to expand the opportunities to leverage a down-payment. Most of the people in this community make enough money to own a home. "Poor people do work. Some of them have two or three jobs at minimum wage or slightly above. Creative financing is the issue: How do you subsidize down-payments to expand the opportunities of Roxbury's working poor when under normal circumstances they would be locked out?" Looking at his analysis, I see how the City could really be instrumental here.

One solution could be for the City to create a loan fund, whereby working poor could be given the opportunity to own a home through a subsidized down-payment. It's really the down-payment that's holding some renters in their situations. If working poor can't own their homes in DSNI, then who is the development for? The partnership can stabilize the community by bringing in new people with mixed incomes. But they should also build the capacity of the working poor so that more people can share in the DSNI vision. This means that there needs to be instituted new initiatives to complement past organizing successes like building blocks are used as a foundation to go further.

It seems to Bruce that there needs to be an analysis of what other relationships are being fostered in DSNI. He says that there are relationships being built with top-down planning institutions, and paternal institutions such as the Catholic Church, whereby projects chosen for success are those that are connected with these institutions, such as Sister Sue's Project Hope.
On economic development, Bruce talked about how families in the Dudley neighborhood have to go outside the community for basic goods and services, because the drug trade operates in every commercial district in Roxbury. "We are all hurt, directly or indirectly, by drugs and violence. We have to be aware personally about what we are doing to each other. The solutions to these problems will not come overnight. We didn’t get to where we are overnight. Some people are looking for fast solutions. These are marginal successes. DSNI has created a process whereby the most affected have the most responsibility for making change.” But this change must be internal - people will have to set new social standards of what is the norm of behavior, what is acceptable. For example, in some cities, there are now curfews. Young people are not allowed to be in the streets beyond a certain time - imposed by some City regulation or law. An internal change, I don’t need to go to Bruce Bolling to have him enact a City ordinance whereby my child and other people’s children have to be in the house by eleven o’clock. That’s something I personally can change. We both talked about how City councilor and researcher in our youth left what we were doing and ran home because our mothers and fathers had a strict time for us to be there. They didn’t need a policeman to enforce their curfew. The community doesn’t need one today. We need to make individual changes and then social changes.

Does “internal change” preclude professionals such as the staff at DSNI from assisting in that change? He didn’t hesitate to reply, “When people are willing to change, then people will assist them in making change. But the impetus, the onus, has to come from within.”

MUHAMMED ALI-SALAAM

DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING AND ZONING, BRA

Muhammed says that the BRA is where all the bomb-throwers at City Hall work. Bob Coyle in the early 1980s started focussing on the DSNI area in a conscious effort to teach PFD how to be planners and implementors. This dates back to the history of how PFD and the BRA
originated and were reorganized. Ed Logue, the first director of the BRA not only organized the BRA but reorganized other City departments. Every line agency in place today in the City of Boston can trace its origin to Ed Logue. PFD was responsible for building and maintenance of municipal buildings, libraries, police stations, schools. The Boston Housing Authority (BHA) was the housing agency and the original urban renewal administrators. After the infamous West End debacle, Logue realized that the BHA was not equipped to manage public housing and also manage and plan the strategy for urban renewal in Boston. He combined the urban renewal function of the BHA with the City planning agency, and named it the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA).

During the Nixon Administration, which coincided with the third administration of Mayor Kevin White, CDBG funds were used to pad the White political army. It was during this time that Mayor White decided to break up the BRA and spawn the NDEA. The BRA planned everything north of Massachusetts Avenue. This has some real political and racial implications. During that time, Mayor White had visions of the vice-presidency under President Carter. But the vision of little Black children being beaten on their way to school during the busing crisis resulted in his being opposed by every civil rights organization in Boston, including the NAACP. Vindictively, he decided to get even. “Nothing would happen, South of Mass Ave, particularly in Roxbury.” Simultaneously, the Route 1-95 confrontation was being organized. The Block the Highway Movement was the real issue that galvanized the community. One of the principle activists was Chuck Turner. White saw this as an opportunity to use this impetus for his reelection. He needed Roxbury against Louise Day Hicks, who used forced busing, and anti-desegregation as her platform. White used one of his political organizers, Frank Salvucci, to help build a coalition with the activists striving to stop Route I-95. It was successful and White came out looking like the hero. But the violence, division, and his lack of control during the forced busing, depicted his administration as morally bankrupt. “If you are responsible for providing the political leadership for a half a million people, you
just can’t walk away.” Mohammed related White’s lack of leadership as turning the other cheek. “The poor are heavily impacted by a lack of leadership while the rich and powerful are not impacted at all”.

Mohammed started work with NDEA in 1978-79 after having worked with CDCs in Dorchester/Roxbury. He is very sensitive and emotional about his constituency, people of color in disenfranchised communities. He makes no excuses. He related that he didn’t understand at the time he worked with CDCs why the community was in the condition that it was with blight, empty land, hopelessness, when in Boston there were five Title Seven CDCs, and one of them, the Greater Roxbury Development Corporation (GRDC), was in Roxbury. The reason that this appalled him was in their funding mechanism. Title Seven CDCs were funded directly by the federal government through the Community Services Administration during the Model Cities era. He gave as an example a Bedford-Stuyvesant CDC which was funded to the tune of $52 million - this was their budget for one year. The money came from the federal government and private non-profit foundations. The relationship here is that Mohammed comes from that neighborhood and the director of the CDC is now the director of the Ford Foundation, a principal funding source for DSNI. He was amazed at the funding levels and the community development outcomes, which he characterized as “no success.”

So while working in Roxbury/North Dorchester and knowing the amounts of money that were coming to areas such as these, he had a fundamental question: “Why is the community in the condition that it is?” It wasn’t because of lack of money. He concluded it must be politics. A friend of his and now City councilor, Bruce Bolling, was instrumental in getting him a job in NDEA, “I’m very emotional when I’m talking about community development in Roxbury and people of color. When I came on board the NDEA, it was the neighborhood planning agency. When White broke up the BRA into NDEA, he created a haven for political hacks.” Mohammed, because of his commitment, did not fall into this category. He was tasked to work in Roxbury/North Dorchester to promote commercial development. “It didn’t make any sense to
me how people could tolerate this dirt. The blight and alcoholism around Dudley Station was one of the eyesores, and it was evident to him from the start that the development of Orchard Park was linked to Dudley Station's rehabilitation.” Orchard Park is a housing project at Dudley Station owned by the BHA. During this time, the BHA was under federal receivership.

Another hindrance to development of Dudley Station was the legal and illegal trash transfer stations that proliferated in the Dudley Street-St. Patrick’s neighborhood. But NDEA had a particular flaw in its development schemes: It could not own land. It could fund individuals (never enough to do the job). All they got was money. And this money was to buy Mayor White a positive media image. The money would go for commercial improvement but actually all it did was buy facades. There was a conscious effort not to share information.

*Influence through Nondecisions:* An absolute prerequisite to ad hoc neighborhood mobilization is information that the policy threat (the *hoc*) exists or is in the planning stage. City officials, and in some cases the private developers, often have access to this information and control over when and how it will be distributed. They may delay or permanently prevent the evolution of a latent neighborhood response by (1) withholding information that is already available; (2) failing to generate information that is relevant and technologically and legally accessible; (3) being purposefully ambiguous in discussing proposals; and (4) resorting to outright deception.26

Case in point: Muhammed was asked to put a capital planning budget in place for Roxbury. He looked at potholes, streetlights that hadn’t worked in memory, a totally decayed infrastructure. He submitted the plan to his superiors, who instructed him to cut it back because “we can’t spend that kind of money in Roxbury the time frame allotted.” They would spend the money in other communities!

To give an example of top-down municipal control in the Dudley area, Muhammed relates a telling story. While doing outreach to put together his capital planning budget, he came across

26 *Neighborhood Mobilization*, p. 204.
a businessman in Eliot Square, now the site of the Cox Building rehabilitation. The businessman wanted to extend the sidewalk so that he could use more space. The sidewalk was totally dilapidated and he would be doing the neighborhood some good. So Muhammed told him, why should he spend his money fixing up the sidewalk when the City should and could do it. He helped the businessman put together a plan which he submitted to the City for capital improvement, and his plan actually coincided with NDEA. The City actually wanted to slow down traffic by extending the very sidewalk that the businessman wanted to extend. But because Muhammed had infused a resident businessman into the process, his superiors tried to reprimand him. His direct supervisor told him, “you should not be talking with presidents of major corporations about capital improvements.” To which Muhammed responded that as long as the Constitution stood, “you can’t tell me who to talk to.” It was during this time that Muhammed concluded that NDEA was not set up technically, nor morally capable of implementing community development plans in Roxbury.

“This is absolutely crazy.” He decided to leave after two years with the City. But Mayor White decided not to run and when Raymond Flynn defeated Mel King an administrator asked him to talk with Stephen Coyle. Raymond Flynn’s administration did a survey to find out who among the staff knew about Roxbury/North Dorchester. And all fingers pointed to Muhammed. His experience was valuable. Stephen Coyle asked him to put together a position paper and come up with some alternative solutions for the development of Roxbury. He hired him on as a consultant with Randy Jones, an architect/planner, to do the redevelopment plan for Roxbury. They were asking questions that were never asked before: “What would happen when the El comes down?” “What would be the impact of all the new construction, which if uncoordinated, would cause great stress on the Roxbury community?” The proposed move of the Orange Line came at a time when other construction was going on, for instance, Shawmut Avenue. This, in conjunction with a largescale project such as the relocation of the Orange Line, with its heavy machinery, had not been coordinated and, left that way, would be devastating. Muhammed’s
The Interactive Process

plan called for the coordination of these events into a comprehensive development plan for Dudley Station. But NDEA was balking at his coordinated plan. They just were not equipped. That role was the BRA's. He submitted it to the BRA and they ran with it. He was willing to stay and see it through. The result of his study is the basis of the Dudley Plan. But he says that the actual Dudley Plan was a compilation of studies, already paid for by the community. It was not new. But most people didn't know of these studies. Muhammed put them together using the updated capabilities of the BRA's graphic design department, into a glossy plan - "A Framework for Discussion" - which called for 2000 units of housing, expansion of the commercial space which would result in 15,000 jobs. The price tag: $750 million. Initially, their plan called for horizontal growth with strict limitations of building height - no skyscrapers.

Stephen Coyle, on the other hand, infused into the plan his thinking on inner-city planning. He introduced skyscraper designs in various districts, such as the Melnea Cass Boulevard district, and added environmental impact issues. In addition, he was concerned about the historic preservation areas. Politically-speaking, the plan created some fallout. After all, Ray won the election, but Mel won 96% of Roxbury. "Why stick your neck out and help them? They didn't help you." This was the attitude of some of the Mayor's advisors who were looking for the community development dollars to go into their neighborhoods. Coyle's position was that developing Roxbury was "what moral leadership is all about." In order to dramatize the issue, he came up with the "parcel to parcel linkage" concept. The linkage program was not new. It was already in place, but the parcel-to-parcel concept would allow development to occur faster than normal and to occur in those areas that met investment standards of the market, but had been traditionally ignored. The logic for excluding neighborhoods such as Roxbury for real development was "safety" and transportation concerns, which BRA studies totally dispelled. Geographically, Roxbury is in the center of the City and you can travel anywhere in the City within minutes. Safety was a non-issue.
But Roxbury's development was not the only thing that was on Coyle's agenda. There was a projected $20 billion coming into Boston for development. Without controls, the buildout would be tremendous, like New York. This was partly due to the 1970s low real estate market and Mayor White's "giving away the store" to attract developers. During the 1970s, Mayor White was the BRA director. He personally approved every major project in Boston. "If you didn't play ball with Kevin, nothing gets done in Boston." On the other hand, the real estate boom of the 1980s was a real contrast. Lured by Mayor White's bait in the 1970s, developers with incentives to make high profits in the current real estate market were exerting tremendous political pressure on the City administration.

The Boston Herald broke the Dudley Plan study on the front page. Ray Flynn's attitude about the plan was that it was the right thing to do. Muhammed had to educate his fellow planners at the BRA, though. They were not used to working in communities such as Roxbury. To educate them, he created a visual aid. He took BRA pictures from all the studies and put them together on the wall. And he would ask people, "where do you think this is?" The pictures were from the Dudley, Blue Hill Ave, and Grove Hall areas of Roxbury. To some, "Roxbury looked like Hiroshima." Most of the young planners couldn't understand that this was happening in their own City. To Muhammed, his reason for educating them was "what good is a planner if they can't help their neighbors?" And he was going to make sure that this neighborhood benefitted. "If we don't, who are we kidding?"

When he put together this vision and coupled it with all the BRA studies done in Roxbury, "it blew peoples' minds." All the empty land in that area was acquired through foreclosure and owned by some public agency. Because Roxbury was not an urban renewal area, the BRA could not acquire land by eminent domain. He wondered which agency was capable of making a difference here. During this time, NDEA was absorbed into PFD. Lisa Chapnick takes over. In another corner of Roxbury, DSNI is born.
Muhammed's strategy for developing the Dudley Square area had three steps:

1. identify the owners of the land
2. assemble it
3. assist a community group to develop it

The BRA had two choices. "We [the BRA] can do it." Or, "we can show you how to do it." The BRA didn't acquire land that it didn't develop right away. Because this was a long term strategy, it had to come up with a different mechanism. Muhammed suggested that they assemble the land and designate it to Nuestra Comunidad. The process is as follows: The BRA assembled sixty-three parcels and called it, "The Dudley Triangle." They would get the deeds from the real property division and put out requests for proposals (RFPs) to develop. The intention was to give the property to a non-profit group, initially in a tentative designation, during which time the group would put together a finance plan. But the legal responsibility for the land would remain with the BRA. This effectively relieves the non-profit organization from the legal responsibility for the land while putting together the financing package for development. Upon final designation, the group assumes all responsibility for the land.

I asked him about the 121A and eminent domain that the BRA had transferred to DSNI. He said that this was PFD's ploy to get back into the game. Because the PFD in its structure cannot take land through eminent domain unless they're going to build municipal buildings. By pushing DSNI to acquire private land through eminent domain and assemble it with the PFD-owned public land, they become partners and a controlling factor in the development of Roxbury - getting back a piece of the pie. (they had to keep themselves necessary)

Eminent domain has never been given to a community group before. It is usually used to drive private development. It's typically given to private developers, guaranteeing them a certain
lower tax rate as an incentive for development. Conditions here are: First, demonstrate that you can meet the fair market value for the land that you wish to take. Second, that you have a financial plan and the means to build the project within a prescribed time frame. This could be the undoing of DSNI’s plan, this time constraint, because their funding sources aren’t really coming through for the total buildout and they’ve proposed to take a large tract of land. The danger here is that they may not have the funding to develop it and the land then reverts back to the City.

In his opinion, DSNI did not need eminent domain to build its community. In fact, the sixty-three parcels in the Triangle that the BRA had assembled could have been designated directly to DSNI for development without the time constraints that eminent domain brings. The BRA’s role in this relationship is to create a market in which the private sector, including the non-profit private sector, creates the housing. In the BRA’s initial proposal for the Dudley Triangle, the president of 1st American Bank promised to underwrite any mortgage in the area, because the Cape Verdean community had all their savings in that bank. The BRA made strong efforts to include the Cape Verdean community for that very reason.

Muhammed says that right now, PFD and its director, Lisa Chapnick are vindictive toward him. But he is executing a plan that was already sanctioned. In his opinion, eminent domain advice came from PFD to DSNI and they didn’t do them any favors. The BRA is supportive of DSNI and PFD’s plan for joint partnership in the development of Roxbury. “But who is committed to the capital improvement in the area? PFD is not technically capable of master-planning.” The way the department treats it staff is non-supportive; making the best planners leave. They don’t have the experience in traffic, infrastructure, and safety. “PFD always shoots themselves in the head at community meetings - they’re unprepared.”

What should happen? PFD tentatively designates DSNI as developer of the Dudley Triangle. This gives them development rights when they get their finances in place. They can develop
the parcels that they receive the funding for within the triangle. Let the market do the rest. Use eminent domain when obstructions appear. At this point, PFD would be out of the dance.

I asked him about “letting the market do the rest” and how that can fuel displacement and gentrification. He said that the real issue is not displacement and gentrification, but their causes. When people don’t have equal access to good jobs, training, and education, they are at the mercy of speculation. For example, he looks at improvements for a homeowner in Roxbury as increasing the homeowner’s equity and also increasing taxes for the City’s revenue base. Looked at in this way, they are both positive. But if people can’t find equal access to jobs, then a secondary influence to this homeowner’s upgrading his property could be gentrification of the surrounding area. Because the people in the surrounding area may not have access to good jobs and may not be able to pay what the market can bear. Displacement and gentrification, looked at in this way, are symptoms of broader economic conditions.

ADALBERTO TEIXEIRA, COORDINATOR OF NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES, CITY OF BOSTON
FORMER COMMUNITY ORGANIZER, DSNI

Adalberto says that before DSNI was born in Roxbury, his community, the Cape Verdeans, were just beginning to organize themselves. But in the fight against the trash transfer stations, it was mostly individuals that lived near the dumps and these were new immigrants that didn’t know their rights and mostly elderly people. They were basically leaderless, devoid both of individual leadership and institutional leadership. DSNI filled that void as a catalyst for change. It was the victories over the trash transfer stations that galvanized the community. Because individuals benefitted; they felt empowered by the closures.

On the relationship between the City and DSNI, he said that it’s important for DSNI to continue the relationship because DSNI has control of the land. But if they have no resources to develop, then there’s a problem. If they stay connected in a partnership with PFD, through
this relationship PFD acts as a conduit for City resources. We discussed the dynamic of control of the development process exerted through PFD's control of resources. He said “that’s the price of democracy, which may slow the process down, but in the participatory process, you have more people (institutions or individuals) adding their advice on decisions made.”

On human development issues, Adalberto pointed to the drugs in the community. “We are a community under siege. To make the community safer, we need special ordinances, like curfews.” He said that if he is an upstanding citizen, he should not be afraid of “stop and search” as long as the police don’t abuse it. The stop and search policy would curtail some of the drug use in the area. He said, you can’t have it both ways. You can’t complain about drugs and also complain about the police’s tactics. He says that solution to the drug problem in the Dudley area, in the short run, is for the police to be given broader powers. It’s not the law-abiding citizen who is in the street in the first place to suffer police brutality. Some activists put the responsibility for arresting the drug traffic on the community residents. But this is naïve. Most neighbors know who’s dealing drugs. But unlike the owners of the trash transfer stations, drug dealers can act violently against their accusers. “Guns have changed the equation of how people interact.”

We talked about human development and how DSNI’s comprehensive plan includes a human development strategy. We both came to the realization that, given that drugs and crime are the most pressing ills in the Dudley area, and assuming that the underpinnings of that problem are human development, then the impact on drugs and crime can be measured as the success of the human development strategy. No matter what community development model you use, if the people in the community are being afflicted by a particular pathology, then the impact of any community-development strategy can be measured by its impact on that pathology. Drug abuse and crime is a human development issue. Human development has to do with choices. Choices about your role, your choice in life, how it affects the human development of the overall community. So there’s two human developments going on here: there’s your individual
human development and the impacts of choices the individual’s choices on the overall community. The collective level of human development is connected with the individual’s.

Adalberto’s solutions to the drug and crime problem in the Dudley area is that you have to look at causes first. Single mothers can’t control the young male children that they have. The world takes them away. The conspicuous consumption that is prevalent in this society through the media wreaks havoc on undisciplined youth. Parents need to be parents. They have responsibility for their children, even into adulthood. Abdicating that responsibility creates the problems in the Dudley area, for example, ‘children having children.’ This is a pattern. Their children will have children, continuing the cycle. Parental responsibility will not be handed down. This needs to be taught. The end result will be good parents. Coupled with this, opportunities need to expand. Inner-city youth need access to good public education, which will give them access to training and college. But this social structure begins at home and if the family is broken then the outlook is sure to be bleak. “I must control my son. This is my responsibility. When I abdicate that responsibility it is my neighbors who suffer and it becomes their responsibility.” We concluded this portion of the interview with the mutual agreement that a visible measure of DSNI’s human development strategy, within the comprehensive development strategy, is the measure of crime and drugs in the Dudley area.

On economic development, he said that the businesses along the Dudley Street area are, for the most part, not meeting the neighborhood’s needs. When one walks into many of these small businesses, one sees empty shelves and lack of cleanliness. This drives neighbors to shop elsewhere where they can receive the services they want. The inattention to the people’s needs may be fueled by small businesses along this strip deriving benefit from the drug trade, whether by direct or indirect involvement. The traffic is a ready market for non-nutritional food. Businesses don’t have to keep a stock of family foodstuffs or keep their areas clean to attract customers. This is why human development must come before economic development. “If you don’t invest in the people, how can you develop the land. Develop the people first, then
economic development will follow". By giving the people a quality of life, they become more aware of what their needs are and how to satisfy those needs. Without a higher quality of life, we will continue under siege and developers will think twice about coming in. Adalberto is an exception to my brain drain theory, in which community leaders step into existing bureaucracies and become distanced from their constituency. He is the direct link between City Hall and its resources and his Cape Verdean community in Roxbury. But he is the only one and I see that it is taking its toll.

Chuck Turner

Executive Director, Center for Community Action

What I wanted from Chuck was for him to put the Roxbury Neighborhood Council (RNC) into historical context. This is important for this study because the Roxbury Neighborhood Council was initiated in 1985 as an elected representative body so that the Roxbury community could have input into its imminent development. As I stated before, downtown development was putting tremendous pressure for development on Roxbury, and the vast empty land was becoming exceedingly valuable. The RNC's roots trace back to a meeting called by Mel King in 1984 to strategize on the empty land, because of the development pressure. This meetingpropogated the Greater Roxbury Neighborhood Authority (GRNA) and Roxbury Neighborhood Council to protect the community. Chuck Turner, along time Boston community activist, was a member of this group.

In October of 1985, the RNC met with Mayor Ray Flynn. The members were pressing him for authority in the master planning of Roxbury. The Mayor's response was to agree to authorize the RNC as his body to oversee land disposition and zoning work. He also sanctioned neighborhood councils in Jamaica Plain, the North End, Codman Square, and Chinatown. These councils were designed to have advisory capacity with no decisionmaking authority. The
Mayor appointed eight members to join the thirteen elected Roxbury residents in the RNC. The issue here was authority. The community wanted a decisionmaking capacity in its development; the Mayor wanted control. 1986, the RNC took the City to court in a suit over participation in community development. They pressed the City incessantly for two years. The City and the RNC settled out of court. This led to the RNC working with the BRA to create an Interim Planning Overlay District (IPOD) plan. The RNC initiated the process with the BRA's Muhammed Salaam.

On DSNI's involvement in this process, Chuck Turner stated that DSNI had a seat on the RNC and Peter Medoff, then Executive Director of DSNI, served on the RNC. The involvement of the RNC with the City and to what extent this was a method of controlling the community is evident when put in a greater context. For example: The Roxbury community was pressing for decisionmaking power in its community development through the existing institutions - the Mayor and the BRA. On the other hand, you had Project Fate, which was actively organizing the Roxbury community for the incorporation of Mandela, a separate municipality with the general boundaries of Roxbury within it. Furthermore, this was election time. The Mayor decided to create a PFD-DSNI partnership. He touted this as an innovative decision on his part, giving eminent domain authority to a community group. The Mayor could then use DSNI as an example of his commitment to Roxbury's land control movement, thereby defusing the Mandela incorporation initiative. The Mayor went so far as to use Roxbury's own leadership to defuse the Mandela movement. The Reverend Charles Stith, renowned spokesman for Boston's Black community, came out in favor of the Mayor's plan and opposed the Mandela movement.

In all actuality, DSNI is a very small concession to the Roxbury residents. The land control movement is a much larger movement in Roxbury. But DSNI can be pointed to by the Mayor through the media to foster his populist political ambitions and to quench the demands for actual self-determination.
Evidence for what Chuck Turner revealed to me can be found in the following: The original application from DSNI to the BRA for eminent domain called for a much more involved RNC. The DSNI board was adamant that the RNC be included in the development process. This section was subsequently dropped by the City from the final agreement. Chuck also saw that in the partnership between PFD and DSNI the dominance exerted by the Mayor was about control. PFD’s goal in this plan, as Chuck sees it, is to push for the inclusion of higher income middle-class people into Roxbury, thereby expanding the revenue base. He pointed to the homeownership impetus of the plan. But he also looked at cooperative housing as a bridge between the needs of the community and the needs of the City. As a solution to Roxbury’s historical powerless position, he suggested that Black and Latino communities need to build unity in order to control our turf. “Downtown Boston, Charlestown, West Roxbury, and South Boston have a complexity that impedes our finding new ways for our growth. Mandela is a way to create that powerbase.”

**Julio Henriquez, Development Committee Member, DSNI**

**Longtime Roxbury Resident**

Julio’s description of the dance started with his definition of partnership: A relationship wherein two or more entities communicate with a shared goal and an equal voice. In the current partnership with PFD, DSNI is a subordinate agent of City policy. The City is using DSNI as a smokescreen to foster its plans. Then, when the community bucks or rebels, City politicians and political advisors tell the community, “what’s the matter with you, we’re trying to help.” He said he had direct evidence of PFD’s control by excluding key members of the opposition from PFD/DSNI meetings. The result is that nothing is being built. No dirt has been dug. He asked a question, “what do people in this neighborhood really need?” He drew me a picture. Within the community, the first priority is to the homeless women with babies. They have no shelter.
for a lot of reasons. But these should be the first to benefit from our comprehensive plan. But if you look at the current policy, the PFD-DSNI joint policy, the impetus is on “fee-simple” housing and cooperatives. Most people know that even with a Section 8 certificate, which most of these women don’t have, a family cannot afford either of those solutions to their homelessness.

Homeownership as a total strategy is shortsighted and will drive out the renters, who are about eighty percent of the neighborhood. In the DSNI neighborhood, most homeowners live in two-family homes, with renters. The homeownership and cooperatives strategy needs to be reevaluated based on today’s soft market and community needs. Currently, there is no market for homes, as the condominium market attests. But Julio proposed a solution: Build some good rental apartments that the people can afford and hire good management that will offer the services, making the people proud of their development. Good management is the key here. He also added that for success, a keen eye on the support services system is vital.

He said that DSNI’s mission had changed, “We’ve lost our mission. Stepping away from the mission means that now DSNI has moved away from our original goal - to provide a whole range of the community’s needs. Just building 350 units of housing does not serve those needs. Our biggest concerns right now are healthcare, childcare, and basic subsistence. How do you serve those needs by building 350 units of housing?” We feel like we’re doing something, but we’ve been distracted from our real needs and our energy diverted. Case in point is PFD’s partnership with Futures, Inc., a consortium of developers headed by politician, Joe Timilty. This group built dollhouses in our community. The housing is bad. The architecture is weak. This was an opportunity for the community to get a dollar back from the development. By “the dollar back,” Julio meant that PFD could have targeted some of the development’s profits into helping create a community center or another needed service.

Now, the DSNI board is fragmented on parochial interests, which makes it easily manipulated by PFD. Currently, DSNI is immersed in “missionary” zeal. Some board members are using the board for their own interests or their own development plans. We need to focus on one thing at a time. Julio has voiced concerns over staff leadership. He questions Executive
Director Gus Newport’s level of involvement in community affairs. According to Julio, Gus is very involved in global affairs, and Roxbury might be losing out. At a time of community fragmentation, strong leadership is crucial. Julio sees that DSNI staff has dual responsibilities: 1. Fundraising for DSNI’s day-to-day operations. 2. Implementation of the community’s comprehensive development plan. He thinks that DSNI has deserted the latter. “My fear is that if we are not careful, this community will disappear.” PFD and the Mayor’s people want to change the demographics to increase City revenues by attracting the middle class into Roxbury. Their control of DSNI is evidence of this.

Julio continued to put his vision in economic context. He talked about the economic system and the tremendous flaws. “The Mayor is just spouting rhetoric. For example, throughout Roxbury/North Dorchester and other neighborhoods, the BHA has a vast amount of boarded-up housing units. At the same time, the City supports homeless shelters, like its Long Island Hospital. The operating costs of these shelters could be channelled into rehabilitating the projects. Where is the social conscience? On economic development, Julio was quick to point out that Roxbury’s money leaves the community and the banks do not invest here. Grocery store and liquor store owners live outside. Where is the economic development strategy? Who’s looking at the multiplier effect of Roxbury’s dollar? In addition, why aren’t the churches more involved in community development? The church leadership seems to be at the Mayor’s beck and call. DSNI could play a vital role in organizing the churches to help them satisfy the community’s needs, such as childcare, educational, and recreational programs. “Leadership plays an important role in organizations. Too much of what is going on is in the hands of too few people.” The DSNI board has recently suffered some significant losses. Representatives from St. Patrick’s church and small businesses in the area have left. This may be due to opportunism taking hold of the board - and he didn’t mean entrepreneurial spirit, just out and out opportunism.
At this point of the interview, the phone rings. Sandra, DSNI’s secretary, calls to tell Julio that the Ford Foundation is making a site visit tomorrow morning. His cynicism shows through when he asks, “who changed the meeting from the afternoon to the morning?” Satisfied with her reply, he answers, “In that case, I’ll put on my best suit.” Foundations are looking for a return on their investment. (The Ford Foundation has loaned DSNI $1 million.) The foundations need to see that their investments are sound, but they also want to appear to the public as socially aware. Through this site visit, the Ford Foundation will investigate the strength of the partnership. They will ask questions about DSNI’s subordinate role. They will be asking the question up front and in person.

I asked Julio about his interest in DSNI and in Roxbury’s comprehensive development. Some of this was evident to me, but I needed to ask anyway. After all, I was doing the interview in his home, which he practically hand-built. His house stands on neatly manicured lawns, surrounded by burnt-out shells of houses and empty land as far as you can see. It’s like an oasis. “I live here. I’m interested in my home and what is built around it. My house sits in the middle of most of the empty lots. I tell it like it is. I’m particularly interested in the community center that will be built behind my house.”

Mel King, Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, MIT

Community Leader and Activist

Mel King insisted that the land control movement in Roxbury, of which DSNI is a part, was not a reaction to the BRA’s Dudley Plan. Mel was instrumental in organizing the GRNA and the RNA. Both of these organizations are instrumental in Roxbury’s current land control movement. It was common knowledge that Roxbury would be the next phase in Boston’s development. The real estate market was booming and Roxbury’s proximity to the city was key to its
attractiveness to developers. Mel called a meeting of community leaders, including Chuck Turner, Nelson Merced, and Cornell Brown of Shaleene Management Corporation.

They met at Alianza Hispana in order to build a bridge within the Latino and Black communities in Roxbury. The meeting was called to build an organization and a process by which Roxbury would be protected from displacement. It was proposed that the way to do this was through land control. These leaders also knew that the BRA had been planning in the Dudley Square area. It is Mel's feeling that city politicians learned that his meeting was going to be held and they tried to upstage it by releasing the Dudley Plan. The meeting was on a Saturday evening. On the Saturday morning, the Boston Herald's front page read, "The Dudley Plan: $750 Million for Roxbury." In fact, one of the attendees brought the paper with him and that's how Mel found out about it.

Mel assisted the group by funnelling seed money for a community process through the Burgess fund. Simultaneously, Mel had DUSP students draw maps and put the issues together in Roxbury, which led to the GRNA. This happened shortly after Mel's unsuccessful bid for Boston's mayoralty. In this sense, DSNI and the overall land control movement in Roxbury can be defined as a proactive movement and not reactive as previous interviewees have indicated.

Mel stated that the control dynamic and the partnership between DSNI and PFD is elusive. The questions that one should ask when trying to cast light on control are, What do I have now? What do I want to have? How do I get to where I want to be? For example, on the issue of affordability, which is the splinter causing the partnership much grief now: The short term affordability concession that DSNI may have to give up can later be balanced by the strength garnered from having build something. The question is, how do you balance the short-term and the long-term goals? In this relationship, the fundamental issue is, how do both groups agree to disagree? If it's more important to hold the land, then DSNI should bank it. "When we first started out, we were looking at the Greater Roxbury area. We searched everywhere for vacant
The Interactive Process

land, including the Boston State Hospital site." In his view, DSNI is not a concession. It does not stifle the overall land control movement and DSNI should exert its power and "say that they will not be used as a buffer." In actuality, Mel contends that there should be several groups like DSNI in the Greater Roxbury/Dorchester area. These groups should create comprehensive plans for their particular districts. They should also converge on shared resources, like public transportation and infrastructure. He asserted that it’s not democratic or fair to have one group control all of the planning in Roxbury.

I presented to him Marie Kennedy’s radical analysis. She postulates that in the DSNI-City partnership, failure is imminent. Mayor Flynn would be a political fool to allow an infusion of an uncontrolled critical mass of voters into Roxbury, which voted 96% against him in his contest with Mel. The partnership is a ploy on the Mayor’s part to build credibility and expand his base while gaining control over Roxbury’s land control efforts. Mel dispels this analysis, although not in totality. He points to Parcel 18, the BRA’s economic development proposal for Roxbury, through which Ray Flynn and the BRA has targeted people of color as beneficiaries. He says that it’s not logical for Ray to be this divisive. Mayor Flynn wants to broaden his appeal. After all, he controlled Roxbury during the height of the real estate boom. Kennedy’s analysis negates the community’s ability to apply pressure on the banks and other institutions. In the relationship between the city and the banks, the Mayor has been the tail. Mel reiterated that to say that the land control movement was reactive eliminates an empowered community. “The process was pro-active.”

Langley Keyes, Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, MIT

Model Cities Administrator, 1960s

Over time, Roxbury has built a vocabulary of community development. Starting in 1962, when Roxbury reacted to the West End Slum Clearance, residents Otto and Muriel Snowden organized
mostly middle-class blacks to create the Washington Park urban renewal district, the original “Triangle.” In 1968, the Model Cities program surrounded this district. The current DSNI is actually in Model Cities areas 3 and 4. This vocabulary emanates from a long history and memory of community. The concepts born during this era continued to evolve and are defined today as “land and clearance,” “control of land,” “existing housing,” “participation,” and “who controls.” DSNI is a reworking of the picture, another Triangle. It illustrates the struggle of defining the role of community with the city. The language within which DSNI is defined emanates from the fifth paradigm, or a piece of it anyway, from the Washington Park Urban Renewal District.

On the partnership, Langley started with the 1960s Blue Hill Avenue Plan, which married Roxbury with Kevin White’s political machine. This plan was an effort to enlist the black community in Kevin White’s political ambitions. During that time, Boston got used to large-scale plans, because of Ed Logue. Today, Coyle wants to out-Logue Logue. He makes presentations as if he invented community participation.

The participatory process dates before him and Ray Flynn. Roxbury initially housed middle-class Blacks in Washington Park because of their VA loans and that Boston banks were pushing Blacks into parts of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan. During the Snowdens’ organizing, the middle-class began to flee the city for the suburbs. This was due to suburban development availability due to low-interest mortgages. DSNI’s comprehensive plan is not new, although Lang thought that its tenure of eminent domain was a brilliant move in a way. But he wonders why haven’t other communities petitioned for eminent domain.

Why hasn’t South Boston’s City Councilman Kelly said to Ray Flynn, “why should Roxbury have eminent domain and the organizations in our community not?” I explained to him that in order for a community organization to be endowed with eminent domain power, its neighborhood district would have to be designated an urban renewal district and this would
mean that the area would have privately-owned abandoned land which could be used for public good. In addition, a financial plan with strict building guidelines would have to be submitted to the BRA. In absence of any of these, eminent domain would not be granted.

He thinks that the interesting issue in DSNI’s evolution is “the history of reworking the pieces.” By this he meant the use of the concepts and vocabulary garnered by the community since the pre-model cities era. He also contended that DSNI’s eminent domain may have been a brilliant solution to Ray Flynn’s political and institutional problems. For instance, there were institutional or internal problems because of the competition between Lisa Chapnick and Stephen Coyle, directors of PFD and the BRA, respectively. Moreover, DSNI, as a precedent-setting project, would alleviate the external political problem - by squelching the Mandela incorporation movement proposed by Project Fate.

The development process was simple before the public-private partnership. When the feds had the money, it was easy to build housing. But now, there are so many different forms of public-private partnerships and a myriad of mortgaging schemes, such as 707s, Section 8s, you name it. These are presented today euphemistically as “creative financing,” which really means that you have to splice things together. According to Langley, DSNI holds for us a lot of dear concepts, some of them verging on sloganism, “power to the people.” A populist mayor like Mayor Flynn can use DSNI as a beacon of his support of community land control, yet it doesn’t cost him one cent, because of the private non-profit funding.

The interesting research questions here in DSNI are: In what sense is the process new? What do you do when the feds have gone home? But the actual story is one of reworking an old vocabulary. If DSNI is the daughter of Alianza Hispana, then it is the granddaughter of Model Cities. For it was Model Cities and the Roxbury Multi-Service Center that gave birth to Alianza Hispana.
COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

I tried to reach Luis Prado and Nelson Merced for their views. In both instances my efforts were in vain. I was surprised to find that these two community leaders, like other bureaucrats, also had intensive screening mechanisms, in effect a series of gatekeepers.

Nelson Merced was the Executive Director of Alianza Hispana during DSNI's birth. (Alianza Hispana was one of the original members of DSNI, and in actuality DSNI's mother, for it was through Alianza that the Riley Foundation came in contact with the community. It was this contact that initiated the current movement.) Merced has since become the first Hispanic elected official in the state of Massachusetts, representing the Roxbury/North Dorchester area. His unavailability may be related to his being the only elected official representing his constituent group. As such, he must deal with every issue affecting it and his harried schedule precludes his availability to his constituents, which is a dilemma. Here he is representing and advocating for more resources, and yet because of his harried schedule, the gulf between himself and individuals from that group widens becoming unmanageable.

Luis Prado is currently the Executive Director of Alianza Hispana. His unavailability may be related to the human service cuts that the state is experiencing under the Weld Administration. Alianza is dependent on state budgets for its delivery of services. As the community services diminish, his activities become more and more of a fundraiser and his time is very valuable. This creates a gap between community contact on a personal level and community advocacy at an institutional level.

Both Nelson and Luis' perspectives on the dance would have been valuable for this study, but are not critical because I have interviewed others on both sides of the dance. The difficulty I had leads me to wonder, what is the effect on the community of these leaders' unavailability?
They seem to be overburdened within the bureaucratic and legislative institutions - the institutions that they chose to enter in order to wrest resources for their constituent groups. Have these institutions swallowed them up, rendering them ineffective by removing them from their base?
APPENDIX II

SOURCES OF FUNDS (DSNI AND PFD)

DSNI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public T</td>
<td>32,203</td>
<td>77,797</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOCD</td>
<td>32,203</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFD (MAP/TAP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private T</td>
<td>222,250</td>
<td>175,087</td>
<td>350,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Foundation</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley Foundation</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan/Columbia Plaza Venture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Boston</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Mott Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for Human Dvelop</td>
<td>36,250</td>
<td>40,087</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyams Trust</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Globe Fndtn</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipper Ship Fndtn</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawmut Charitable F</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polaroid Foundation</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Street Bank Fndation</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Foundation</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotus Philanthropy Proj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess Urban Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton, John W. Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Ch of Christ (AMS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hancock</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind Contributions T</td>
<td>58,463</td>
<td>195,756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal</td>
<td>42,013</td>
<td>174,106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tech assistance (CTAC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>others, incl: space, furniture, interns, etc.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services (city - PFD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* proposals were submitted but the results were not available

**PFD**

PFD's projected funding level for 1991 is approximately $60M, of which $41M is targeted to its housing and neighborhood development division (HNDP). This division assists projects such as DSNI's.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Projected 1991 amount (in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>15.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (EOCD)</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Rehab</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDF</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIF</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 705</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 689</td>
<td>18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (Linkage Program)</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health and Education

Conditions of health and educational attainment reveal that Roxbury residents have made some substantial gains over the last thirty years but continue to lag behind other Bostonians. Roxbury's very high birth rate is in large part due to unmarried teenage mothers. Twice as many Roxbury babies die as infants and many more low-weight babies are born in Roxbury than in Boston as a whole. Violence and accidents claim the lives of many young people in the neighborhood. Setbacks in health statistics in recent years are due to cutbacks in Federal medicaid and nutritional programs.

Since 1950, a great proportion of Roxbury adults have obtained a high school education, yet attainment still trails the City and metropolitan rates. The deficiency in college education between Roxbury and Boston residents is more striking. Education, the key to better jobs and higher incomes, is just barely keeping pace with rapidly rising skills needs for modern business.

- The birth rate in Roxbury for 1981-82 was 21 per 1,000 residents, which was much larger than the 14.5 mark for Boston and the 12.5 mark for the metropolitan area; it was also larger than the 16 per 1,000 for the U.S.

- Teenagers accounted for 26 percent of all Roxbury births compared to 17 percent of Boston births and 16 percent of U.S. births.

- Many low-weight babies are born in Roxbury probably due to poor prenatal care, improper maternal nutrition, and teenage mothers.

- The infant mortality rate in Roxbury at 20.5 per 1,000 births was 50 percent greater than the Citywide rate.

- Five solid waste transfer stations operate illegally or improperly near the Dudley Square area of Roxbury. [Initial DSNI organizing victories have eradicated this problem as of 1987.]

---
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- Fifty-seven percent of Roxbury’s adults were high school graduates in 1980 compared with 68 percent of Boston’s adults, 77.2 percent for metropolitan Boston, and 67 percent for the U.S.

- Nine percent of Roxbury adults have at least a 4 year college degree compared with 20 percent of Boston’s adults, 25 percent of the metropolitan area’s adults, and 16 percent of all American adults.

- Due to the large numbers of young people in Roxbury, about one-third of all residents are in school from grade school through college.

Crime

Crime data (on Part One major crimes) for District 2 (Roxbury/Mission Hill) in 1984 show a 4.5 percent decline over figures for 1978. Although property crimes were down 12 percent over this period, violent crimes were up about 15 percent.

Crime in Greater Roxbury (Police District 2) during 1984 was only slightly above City-wide averages at 117.7 per 1000 persons compared to 112.9. The incidence of property crime in Roxbury is somewhat smaller than in Boston as a whole. Violent crimes, however, are committed at about double the rate for Boston. In Boston, 27 percent of all violent crimes are committed in the Roxbury Police District which contains only 13 percent of Boston’s population. This contrasts with the 12 percent share of all City property crime that is committed in Roxbury.

According to 1981 Census Bureau statistics, the Boston crime rate was topped only by New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Dallas, and Phoenix. The Boston Police Department reported, however, that in 1984 crime in Boston was down 5.6 percent from 1983 and that crime in District 2 was down 7.5 percent...

- For 1984, District 2 crimes were down 7.5% from 1983. Personal crimes were down 8.3%, while property crimes were down 7.2%.

- District 2 had 13 percent of the City population in 1984; 28 percent of personal crimes and 12 percent of property crimes.

- Violent crimes, where Roxbury has a problem, comprise aggravated assault, robbery, rape, and manslaughter. Property crimes, less of a problem, include burglary, larceny, and auto theft...

Housing Stock

Housing characteristics of Roxbury show that residents live primarily in multi-family rental housing rather than in their own homes and that they occupy houses of generally lower value and poorer condition. Only 13 percent of Roxbury residents owned their homes, a rate less than half the Citywide norm. In the Dudley Square area, the home ownership rate is only 4 percent. Although family sizes in Roxbury are greater than City averages, housing units sizes are average and therefore there are more persons per unit and greater
problems with overcrowding. While 11.6 percent of Roxbury housing was vacant, there were over 330 uninhabitable boarded housing units and the vacancy rate for apartments (less than 2 months) was only 28 percent. The housing stock in Roxbury is somewhat newer than that for the City because of the more recent construction of publicly assisted housing and vast demolition of many older structures between 1960 and 1980.

- In 1980, 13 percent of Roxbury’s housing units were owner-occupied and 87 percent were rental units. Dudley's home ownership was only 4 percent. This compares with 27 percent owner-occupied and 73 percent rental, Citywide.

- In 1980, 10 percent of Roxbury’s housing units were vacant, while 2 percent were boarded...

- Roxbury housing averaged over 2.3 persons per occupied unit compared to less than 2 persons Citywide. Overcrowding was about a 50% greater problem in Roxbury.

- Roxbury contained over 330 boarded housing units in 1980...

- More housing in Roxbury is multi-family than for Boston as a whole.

Housing Finances

Data on financial characteristics of housing in Roxbury are neither too readily available nor very reliable. What data exists shows that Roxbury housing is somewhat less costly for other neighborhoods but certainly not very inexpensive given the poorer quality of housing and lower property values. Forty-eight percent of all housing units in Roxbury were either public housing or publicly-assisted in 1980 versus twenty percent of all Boston housing units.

Median gross rent data from the 1980 Census shows that the average rental unit in Roxbury cost $179 compared to $251 for the average Boston unit and $282 for metropolitan area rental units. This data, however, only reflects “cash rent” and does not include public subsidies which would likely make Roxbury rents close to par with City rents as a whole. A study of rents asked for apartments listed in the Boston Globe in 1984 showed Roxbury rents to be $362 per unit compared to $528 per unit City-wide, about a 70 percent share. Given lower incomes of Roxbury residents the percent of income going for rent is almost exactly the same as for Boston as a whole.

From the 1980 Census the median value of owner occupied housing in Roxbury was about sixty percent of the median Boston owner occupied units. However, because of more rent financing and lower down payments the median monthly mortgage cost was about the same as for Boston as a whole. One final point, even though Proposition 2½ revaluation and classification greatly reduced Roxbury property taxes, past liens and foreclosures account for about 25 percent of Roxbury property compared to 13 percent Citywide.

- The median value of owner-occupied housing units in Roxbury was only 61 percent of the median value for Boston as a whole.
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- Roxbury has a high concentration of publicly assisted (including Section 8) housing - 48 percent of all units and 73 percent of all rental units compared to only 20 percent of all units in the City of Boston.

- Rents for Roxbury rental units were lower than the Citywide average but assumed a larger share of residents' income...

- Roxbury monthly rental rates are about 70 percent of Citywide rates but since Roxbury incomes are also about 70 percent of City incomes, the percentage of income for housing is about equal.

- Median owner-occupied housing values in 1980 were $21,845 for Roxbury, $36,000 for Boston, and $56,000 for the metropolitan area.

- About 25 percent of Roxbury property is tax delinquent or foreclosed compared to 13 percent Citywide.

Abandonment and Disinvestment

Over the last thirty years, property in Roxbury experienced significant disinvestment and deterioration. A combination of high property taxes and low property values reinforced this cycle of property decline and negative investment attitudes. Abandonment, foreclosure and deterioration were self-reinforcing causes. The 1980s has ushered in a time of improved financial conditions, yet a large amount of vacant land, foreclosed property, and abandoned buildings still exist as hindrances to development.

- Between 1944 and 1975 the number of taxable parcels in 4 Roxbury wards was reduced by nearly half, representing nearly half of the City's taxable parcel loss over this period.

- Vacant land, excluding public open space, comprises 32 percent of Roxbury's total land area.

- In the eleven precincts surrounding Dudley Square half of the land area, representing 64 percent of the assessed value, is tax-exempt.

- Of all taxable properties, 469 parcels or 14 percent have been tax foreclosed and about another one-third is currently tax delinquent.

- In 1981, 60 percent of the 500,000 square feet of potential office space in the Dudley Square area was vacant.

- In Roxbury between 1955 and 1974 residential property, when adjusted for inflation, suffered an 11 percent loss in value compared to a 29 percent gain Citywide.

- Since 1975, property values in Roxbury have grown faster than the City average. Roxbury single family home prices grew 205 percent from 1975 through 1984 compared to a 155 percent gain Citywide.
• Between fiscal years 1981 and 1984, equalization and Proposition 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) cut total Roxbury taxes by 49 percent, meaning a $586 tax cut for the average Roxbury home owner. Over the same time period the City average tax reduction was 36 percent.

**Roxbury Economic Base**

Over the last fifty years Roxbury has lost much of its economic base - jobs, industry, and business activity. Although not much historical data exists, Roxbury has probably lost at least half of the economic base it once had. Greater Roxbury from Mission Hill through Grove Hall had 9,240 jobs in 1981 while just the Roxbury Study Area (zip code 02119) had 5,903 jobs. Health, business, social, and personal services together with retail trade and government were the industries of specialization. The largest manufacturing industries were electrical machinery, metals, rubber and plastics machinery, and apparel. Roxbury's manufacturing employment alone declined by nearly 400 jobs from 1977 through 1983. Outside of downtown and its surrounding neighborhoods Dudley Square is the largest neighborhood office market in the City with 500,000 square feet, although 60 percent was vacant in 1981. Government, social services, and small professional services used most of the office space. Roxbury contained about 200,000 square feet of retail space in 1981 when sales were estimated to be about $30 million. Dudley Square's retail district has undergone a steady decline in the long run; some stores are healthy but the area lacks such vital stores as a major supermarket and pharmacy.

• In 1981 Greater Roxbury had 396 businesses and 9,240 jobs while the Roxbury Study Area had 321 businesses and 5,903 of those jobs.

• In 1983 the Roxbury Study Area had 44 manufacturing firms and 1,202 jobs, losing 380 jobs since 1978.

• Dudley Square with 500,000 square feet of office space in 1981 was the largest neighborhood office market in Boston but 60 percent of the space was vacant.

• Roxbury had about 89 retail businesses with 715 employees and 40 personal service establishments with 700 employees in 1980.

**Private Investment**

Private investment is a vital stimulus to the economic well-being of any residential and commercial neighborhood. Nevertheless, over the last decade more public than private investment has occurred in the Roxbury neighborhood. The $67 million of private investment in Roxbury from 1975 to 1983 has been primarily aimed at residential and institutional uses, with generally smaller industrial and commercial developments. The trend toward housing and industry largely reflects where current interests were focused and where publicly-assisted programs serve as stimuli. Private investment over the last ten years has been relatively small and unplanned.
From 1974 through 1982 the private to public investment ratios for Boston was 3:1, but only 1:3 for Roxbury.

From 1975 through 1983, there has been 6 million dollars of private investment for Roxbury, 38 million dollars for housing, 16 million dollars for schools, 9 million dollars for industries and 4 million dollars for office and retail building.

Future private investment can serve as a very useful tool for economic development, jobs, and increased business in Dudley Square.

Summary

The Roxbury neighborhood reflects a variety of social, economic, and housing problems. While unemployment, poverty, and disinvestment remain the primary problems to be solved, some improvements have occurred in the last 10 years: specifically, educational attainment, stabilization of crime, advances in professional occupations, and the selected upgrading of the housing stock. Over the last ten years, Boston’s economy as a whole has begun to expand into new vistas of post-industrial America - professional, business, medical, and educational services, finances, real estate, insurance, communications, and high-technology industries. The Roxbury community, however, has not yet shared in this new economic future to any extent. The challenge this report addresses is how to bring the prosperity of Boston’s economy to Roxbury.

The Massachusetts Miracle: Boston’s Role (1987)

From 1976 to 1986, Massachusetts gained 853,000 jobs, a rise of 31 percent, in one decade, surpassing the 26 percent increment for the nation as a whole. In December, 1987, Massachusetts posted a jobless rate of 2.9 percent, and closed the year with an annual average rate of 3.2 percent, the lowest in the State’s history. The miracle in the numbers of jobs created is, by now, well-known...

Boston has emerged as a job machine, with a ratio of jobs to population second only to the nation’s capital...jobs are upscale, with average annual wages 16 percent above those of the State as a whole, in 1986, and consistently exceeding those of the statewide averages in each of the last 10 years. With Massachusetts’ employment growth in finance and services accounting for 60 percent of all job growth, 1976-1986, (in comparison with the three percent contribution of manufacturing), and with Boston’s wage levels setting the pace for personal income flows and tax revenue generation, it can truly be said that Boston is a key to the Massachusetts’ miracle. In effect, Boston’s 108,000 jobs gain since 1976 (50,000 since 1983), and the more than doubling of Boston’s annual average wages over the decade, helped spur the enormous advance in Massachusetts jobs, income and revenue.
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...[Sixty] percent of Boston's workforce commute to work daily. Suburban commuters do well in Boston. It is significant to note that for the 25 Massachusetts' cities and towns with the highest levels of per capita income, in 1986, (as reported in December 1987, by the U.S. Census Bureau and the Massachusetts Institute of Social and Economic Research), twenty-five percent of their labor force worked in Boston. For Weston, topping the list with a per capita income of $35,260, in 1986, 26 percent of the employed labor force worked in Boston. In Dover, second highest with a 1986 per capita income of $28,525, 24.5 percent of the employed labor force worked in Boston...

The City of Boston generates nearly $21 billion for the Commonwealth's economy. Boston, with only 10 percent of the state's population, provides 18.5 percent of all jobs and 21 percent of the goods and services produced in Massachusetts...

In 1984, the most recent year for which comparable data are available, Boston ranked highest with 57 percent of its employment in services, finance, transportation and communication...Development construction in Boston totalled $5 billion in the four year period, 1984-1987, including $2.3 billion in office space, $920 million in retail, hotel and exhibit space, and $834 million in housing.

Boston's Class A Office market, with a third quarter 1987 vacancy rate of 6.4 percent, significantly outperformed other major U.S. office markets, according to the latest publication of the Houston-based "Office Network Report," with lower vacancy and higher absorption rates than those in New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington DC, Atlanta, Houston, Dallas, and Denver...

Boston's own revenues do not grow at a rate sufficient to match the projected increase in costs and the financial demands of economic growth. As a consequence of federal aid cutbacks, and property tax limitation, with all of the munificence of State, Boston's revenues are less than they were, in 1980, measured in dollars of constant value.

ROXBURY IN COMPARISON TO THE MASSACHUSETTS MIRACLE (1985)

But as of 1985, Roxbury was still at the bottom of the economic ladder. In comparison with Boston as a whole, Roxbury, in 1985, had a poverty rate 50 percent higher (31 percent vs. 21 percent), median family income more than one-fourth lower ($15,312 vs. $21,186) unemployment twice as high (9.9 percent vs. 4.8 percent), and twice the share of labor force in low-skilled occupations, operatives and laborers (41 percent vs. 22 percent).

These circumstances flowed from both the attrition of the Roxbury economy as well as barriers to access jobs in Boston's thriving Downtown economy. A smaller share of Roxbury resident workers were employed Downtown (12 percent) than for the City as a whole (20 percent). And, despite their proximity to Downtown, the journey-to-work travel time for more than half of Roxbury's
workers (52 percent) was 30 minutes and over; in comparison, only 42 percent of Boston's workers had travel times of that magnitude.  

Income

Income data show that Roxbury is one of the poorer neighborhoods in Boston. In 1980, Roxbury households earned only 74 percent of the City-wide median income, but because household and family sizes were larger in Roxbury, per capita income was only 69 percent of Boston's rate. As a result, a relatively large number of households in Roxbury require public assistance, in large part, Aid to Families with Dependent Children. However, the smaller gap between the percent of wage earners in Roxbury versus the City compared with the larger income gap shows that Roxbury residents probably have lower-skilled, lower-paying jobs.

- In 1980 Roxbury's median household income was $9,305, only 74 percent of the Boston median of $12,530, and only 50 percent of the metropolitan area median household income.
- The median income for Roxbury families was $10,649, only 66 percent of Boston's $16,062, and 47 percent of the metro median family income.
- Because Roxbury has larger household and family sizes, the per capita income of its residents, $4,515 was only 69 percent of the Boston figure, $6,555.
- The per capita income of the smaller Dudley Square area was $3,541 since this area consists of a sizeable proportion of public housing with many larger families.
- Sixty-eight percent of all Roxbury households had wage and salary earnings, only slightly less than the 75 percent City-wide rate, showing that workers probably have lower paying jobs which makes the income gap greater.
- Thirty-four percent of Roxbury households were on public assistance (excluding subsidized housing), more than double Boston's 15 percent and quite a bit larger than the 9 percent metro and 8 percent U.S. rates...

Poverty

Because of the large average size of Roxbury households, the lower-paying jobs of many residents, and the fact that many families have one parent incomes are lower and poverty is much more prevalent in Roxbury than for the City or Metropolitan area. Roxbury's 29 percent household poverty rate in 1980 was about 50 percent greater than for Boston as a whole and triple the metropolitan share. Family poverty is even greater because of the preponderance of female-

headed households, many of whose mothers cannot work fulltime. Low per capita incomes in Roxbury are compounded by the larger household size. Poverty among the elderly exists at greater than City rates but the problem is moderated by the social security safety net. When calculating the number of persons below 2 times the poverty rate, roughly 60 percent of Roxbury residents can be placed in the low income category.

- Twenty-nine percent of all Roxbury residents had incomes below the official U.S. 1980 poverty level compared to 20 percent of all Bostonians, 9 percent of all metro residents and 12 percent of U.S. residents.

- Twenty-eight percent of Roxbury families and over forty percent of Dudley Square families are below the poverty level compared to 17 percent for all City families and 7 percent of metropolitan area families.

- Nineteen percent of Roxbury's elderly are below the poverty level slightly worse than for all of Boston but better than all Roxbury households because of Social Security.

- Sixty percent of Roxbury residents had low incomes when calculating the share of persons below a level of twice the poverty rate in 1979.

**Employment and Unemployment**

...Roxbury's estimated 12 percent unemployment rate in 1985 is about 3 times the City-wide average...Nearly one-half of Roxbury's workers were in manufacturing, government, personal and health care service industries. Roxbury also has a particularly bad problem with teenage unemployment.

- In 1980, 11,306 Roxbury residents were employed, while over 1,300 were unemployed. Roxbury has a large pool of underutilized labor...

- The three industries with the greatest specialization for Roxbury employees were manufacturing, health services, and government. [Compare with the growth in financial services for the overall Massachusetts economy.]

- Fifty-four percent of Roxbury residents were in the labor force compared to 60 percent for Boston, 64 percent for the metropolitan area and 62 percent for the U.S.

- The 1980 unemployment rate for Roxbury was 10.4 percent at a time when the rate for Boston was 6.1 percent. The rate for Dudley Square was 19 percent.

- Very rough estimates show that Roxbury's unemployment rate may be close to 12 percent in 1985 while the City rate is about 4 percent.

- In 1980 the unemployment rate for teenagers without a High School diploma was 40 percent, showing the problems of a young, inexperienced labor force.
APPENDIX IV

POLITICAL THEORIES RELEVANT TO THE DANCE

SOCIAL THEORY

*Class.* Class is a potent concept; actually, it is an amalgam of concepts referring to wealth, world view, education, status, culture, occupation, and income. One of the firmest findings in political science is the strong correlation between conventional political participation and the individual's class. "Citizens of higher social and economic status participate more in politics. This generalization has been confirmed many times in many nations."

Some critics of contemporary urban decision-making structures charge that the poor are excluded because they are unable to mobilize effectively or to generate a convincing threat that they might do so.\(^{31}\)

DEMOCRATIC AND PLURALIST THEORIES

Democratic theory establishes as a normative guidepost the goal that all legitimate interests be accorded reasonable consideration in the governmental decision making process. Where interests are stable and long-standing, it is presumed that they will be articulated through established channels - interest groups, leaders, and lobbyists that have arisen over time specifically to fulfill that function.\(^{32}\)

...that it was the *direct participation* of the citizenry that secured their representation in the decision-making process.\(^{33}\)

Pluralism...has been the dominant approach of those analyzing community politics in contemporary United States, is the likely place to look for a theoretical orientation on neighborhood mobilization. However, instead of a comprehensive theory of mobilization, pluralism offers a *nontheory*, that, like unicausal explanations, underestimates the problematic and complex nature of the mobilization process.\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{31}\) Neighborhood Mobilization, p. 12.

\(^{32}\) Neighborhood Mobilization, p. 11.

\(^{33}\) Neighborhood Mobilization, p. 13.

\(^{34}\) Neighborhood Mobilization, p. 13.
The notion of a frictionless transition plays an integral role in the pluralist revision of traditional democratic theory, which argued that it was the direct participation of the citizenry that secured their representation in the decision-making process...The premise that the path from interest to interest group is a smooth and universally navigable one is, thus, the linchpin of the pluralists' conclusion that political systems (local and national) within the United States are functioning well.35

RATIONAL-CHOICE THEORY

Rational-choice theory, which seeks to explain social behavior with a concise set of axioms that consider the conditions and logic of self-interested behavior, highlights a tension between individual and collective interests that the pluralist model fails to appreciate.36

RADICAL THEORY

Radical theory, based on the distinction between objective and subjective interest, introduces false consciousness, ignorance, and manipulation by elites as additional factors that can hinder the smooth transition from shared interest to interest group.37

NEIGHBORHOOD MOBILIZATION

Neighborhood mobilization can be viewed as the process by which the energies, material resources, loyalties, and political power potentially available to the residents of a specific neighborhood are stimulated and fused into a collective response consistent with their shared interests.38

38 Neighborhood Mobilization, p. 10.